

Promotor     Prof. dr. Mark Janse  
                 Vakgroep Taalkunde  
Copromotor Dr. Floris Bernard  
                 Vakgroep Letterkunde  
                 Prof. dr. Claudia Crocco  
                 Vakgroep Taalkunde

Decaan       Prof. dr. Marc Boone  
Rector       Prof. dr. Anne De Paepe

Nederlandse vertaling:

De Laat Middeleeuws Griekse πολιτικός στίχος poëzie: taal, metrum en discours

Front image: Codex Scaligeranus 55, fol. 62<sup>r</sup> (*Livistros & Rodamni*)

Rubrics:

Ὁ Ἔρως πῶς ἐφάντασεν τὴν κόρην ἐν ὀνείρῳ καὶ πῶς αὐτὴν ἐτόξευσεν ὁ πόθος τοῦ Λιβίστρου  
“How Eros made his appearance to the girl in a dream and how the desire for Livistros hit her”



Faculteit Letteren & Wijsbegeerte

Jorie Soltic

*The Late Medieval Greek*  
*πολιτικός στίχος*  
*poetry*

*Language, metre and discourse*

Proefschrift voorgelegd tot het behalen van de graad van  
Doctor in de taalkunde  
Grieks

2015



# Acknowledgements

χάριν αὐτοῖς πολλήν ὁμολογῶ

(cf. *Digenis Akritis*, Grottaferrata manuscript 6.713)

“I grant great thankfulness to them”

This all started with the smallest words in the Greek language. And with Mark of course, who asked me whether I was interested in doing my master thesis on the distribution of these small words, “object clitic pronouns” to be precise, in the *Digenis Akritis*, which is our first lengthy literary work in the Late Medieval Greek “vernacular” language. In the beginning, I must confess, I was rather sceptical (why would someone spend more than a decade on words which everyone glances over?!), yet after I had read Peter Mackridge’s seminal article on the Late Medieval Greek object clitic pronouns, the clitic microbe kept haunting me as well. The reason why my fascination was triggered, was because these small words teach us much more about Greek than we think at first sight: the phenomenon of clitics “offers insights that extend far beyond the realm of Greek syntax, as clitic distribution has so much to teach us about Greek prosody, pragmatics, literature, and culture” (Goldstein 2010: 235f.).

However, before losing myself in an ode to clitics, I would like to express my gratitude towards a number of people. In the first place, I would like to thank the two men who have already been mentioned: Mark Janse and Peter Mackridge. Mark immediately put aside my prejudice that the intelligence of professors is somehow “compensated” on the social level (though this does not alter the fact that he could stare at a peculiar Greek construction for more than 10 minutes). He has not only a passion for the Greek language, but also shows a sincere solicitude for the future of (the) Greek(s). I could not have wished for a more empathic supervisor: when I was going through emotionally difficult times, he was the first to say that I should take my time. Without Mark’s enormous confidence in me (often more than I had myself), my research proposal would never have been awarded a four-year PhD Fellowship by the Research Foundation Flanders (FWO Vlaanderen; grant no. B/13006/01). Thank you, Mark, for the

many enjoyable coffee breaks, in which we also discussed a variety of unacademic topics such as go-around landings, extremely spicy food and youth traumas in zoos!

It was Peter who gave me the confidence to ignore the surprised faces of my linguist colleagues, when I told them I was doing research on a corpus entirely made up of poetic and even metrical texts: the πολιτικὸς στίχος must indeed have been a very natural metre for the Greeks to compose in! Although having a different background (Modern Greek & literature versus Ancient Greek & linguistics), we often came to the same conclusions. Thank you, Peter, for the stimulating talks during my research stay in Oxford!

In this context, a word of thanks for Marc Lauxtermann & Marjolijne Janssen and Elizabeth & Michael Jeffreys is also appropriate. Closer to home, I think of my two co-supervisors: Claudia Crocco and Floris Bernard. The latter even literally functioned as one of the characters in my corpus and just like Φλώριος in the romance, he never mapped out the easy way, but (eventually) I enjoyed the walks with him (also literally). I also wish to thank Gunnar De Boel, a member of my doctoral committee and another adept of clitics (even of doubled ones!), for sharing his thoughts with me. I might also not forget the attic office of the Lammerstraat, where my colleagues in Greek linguistics (Delphine, Klaas, Metin and Samuel) and I suffered together from either the cold or the heat.

Last but not least, there is my ever-supporting mother. Thank you, njingning, for listening to my nagging the past four years, but especially for always being there for me. Up to this day, my father is convinced that I am using a magnifying glass to spot “small words”, so needless to say that his support was a bit less outspoken... However, I feel grateful that both my parents have always given me the freedom to do what I like (“dead” languages!). I can ensure my other family members and friends that they will soon receive an invitation to eat mezze and drink ouzo in “Zorba de Griek”... Thank you for not asking me at every opportunity how the writing process was going, but for simply drinking glasses of red wine with me.

# Preface

Λοιπόν, τὸν νοῦν ἱστήσατε ν' ἀκούσητε τὸν λόγον  
(Velthandros & Chrysandza 23)  
“Now, pay attention and listen to the discourse”

The Greek language has the longest documented history of any Indo-European language, covering nearly 3500 years of written records (cf. Joseph 1987). It has been subject to intensive linguistic research. However, not every period has been equally well investigated. Medieval Greek was long pressed between Ancient Greek and Modern Greek, both vital fields of linguistic research: it has been treated in a stepmotherly way in comparison with both its predecessor and its current form.<sup>1</sup> As such, Medieval Greek has been largely disregarded until the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Apostolopoulos 1994; Janse 1996-97). Especially the Greek from the later middle ages, which are conventionally defined from the 12<sup>th</sup> to the 15<sup>th</sup> century (cf. Browning 1999<sup>2</sup>), has not received much attention. It is this period with which this dissertation will deal. Late Medieval Greek (LMG) is indeed reputed to be one of the least known periods in the history of Greek (Chila-Markopoulou 2004: 199). Symptomatically, many LMG texts are not yet available on the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (the database of Ancient and Medieval Greek texts) – or only since very recently.

This definitely holds for the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry. These poems, all composed in the metre κατ' ἐξοχήν of this period, i.e. the fifteen-syllable verse or πολιτικὸς

---

<sup>1</sup> Nonetheless, the field of Modern Greek too has suffered from the dominance of Ancient Greek: why do we, for instance, speak of “Modern” Greek and not simply of “Greek” to refer to the contemporary spoken language? (cf. Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warbuton 1997 & 2004).

στίχος<sup>2</sup>, constitute a linguistically underexplored corpus within LMG literature. With regard to the πολιτικὸς στίχος *romances*, which make up the largest part of this type of poetry and which will also make up the corpus of this dissertation, the renowned Byzantinists Agapitos & Smith (1992: 47) have noted: “So little has been done in linguistic analysis of these texts”.<sup>3</sup> More than two decades later, this statement is unfortunately still valid: *if the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry happened to be taken into account in linguistically oriented studies, it was primarily by scholars with a predominantly diachronic interest (who were not necessarily interested in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry per se)*<sup>4</sup>, as Apostolopoulos (1984: xxiif.; my italics) testifies:

“Malheureusement, les études sur le grec médiéval (byzantin), qui auraient sans doute un grand intérêt pour la science de la langue en général et qui faciliteraient les études byzantines en d’autres domaines, ont été jusqu’à ce jour peu poussées. Parmi les travaux effectués depuis les dernières décennies du siècle passé, nous signalons ceux de Hatzidakis, de Psichari et de Jannaris, travaux de valeur scientifique, bien sûr, mais qui, présentés dans *une seule perspective, celle de la ‘diachronie’*, et visant à mettre en lumière l’évolution du grec depuis Homère jusqu’à nos jours, se préoccupent du grec médiéval brièvement, en éclatant son fonctionnement en tant que ‘système’ dans la ‘synchronie’”

Apostolopoulos (1984) himself has written a grammar of the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος romance *Kallimachos & Chrysorroï* and urges that this should be done for all romances. Together with Egea’s (1988) grammar of the *Chronicle of Morea*, this is the only exhaustive linguistic treatment of a LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poem, at least to my knowledge.

That is not to say, though, that linguists have completely neglected all the other LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poems. However, these studies take a rather *restrictive* perspective, focusing on specific grammatical issues, such as the case alternation between accusative and genitive (Lendari & Manolossou 2003), spatial expressions (Tachibana 1994), adverbs and prepositions (Salas 2001), morphological variation (Chábová 2010) and the distribution of the object clitic pronouns.<sup>5</sup> Consequently, we can conclude that linguists

---

<sup>2</sup> By using the term πολιτικὸς στίχος, I follow the contemporary rather than the modern practice (cf. Peri 2012: 145).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Agapitos (1991: 23); Toufexis (2006: 142).

<sup>4</sup> E.g. Jannaris (1897); Tonnet (1993); Browning (1999<sup>2</sup>); Horrocks (2010<sup>2</sup>).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *infra* 4.2.1.2.4 & 5.2.1.3. for much more on the LMG object clitic pronouns.



have withheld from thoroughly investigating the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry *as a whole*.

While such “fragmented” studies are of course unquestionably valid, what is lacking so far is thus a more comprehensive approach. It is my aim to change this: I will offer and develop a theoretical framework in which this type of poetry can *as a whole* be approached. For this purpose, I take advantage of what modern linguistics has to offer to us: my analysis of the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry will be couched in the modern linguistic theory of Information Structure, which has been developed on the basis of contemporary spoken (!) languages. I believe that this theoretical framework can perfectly deal with the poetry’s peculiar features, which I will extensively outline in the introductory chapter. As such, an application of the theory of Information Structure will result in a better understanding of not only the language of the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry, but also of its metre and discourse. Perhaps, it might even lead to more reading pleasure with regard to a type of poetry whose language has once been considered a “Graeco-barbaric hotchpotch”...



## List of Tables

Table 1	Half-verses in the <i>Chronicle of Morea</i>	111
Table 2	Types of differences between H and P	124
Table 3	Distribution of P2 particles γάρ, γοῦν, δ(έ), μέν and οὔν	131
Table 4	Types of clitic doubling	172
Table 5	Information status of doubled objects in AB, VC & LR	178
Table 6	Relation information status and types of doubled objects in AB, VC & LR	179
Table 7	Position of the OCP in OV doubling constructions in AB, VC & LR	182
Table 8	Position of the OCP in OXV doubling constructions in AB, VC & LR	183
Table 9	Frequency of P2 particles	194
Table 10	Frequency of P2 particles in the <i>Digenis Akritis</i> (G vs. E)	195
Table 11	Position of πάλιν	249
Table 12	Grammatical role of the word before non-initial πάλιν	251
Table 13	Word class of the word before non-initial πάλιν	251
Table 14	Frequency of the first person singular present “I say”	263
Table 15	Procedural uses of λέγω	267
Table 16	Metrical position of procedural (parenthetical) λέγω	279
Table 17	Metrical position of conceptual λέγω	279
Table 18	Frequency of the singular imperative of verbs of knowing	281
Table 19	Metrical position of procedural (parenthetical) γνώριζε	292
Table 20	Metrical position of conceptual γνώριζε	292
Table 21	Metrical position of indicatives ἤξευρε and ἐγνώρισε	293



# Table of Contents

<b>Chapter 1</b>	<b>Introduction: status quaestionis of the Late Medieval Greek πολιτικός στίχος poetry .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Status .....	1
1.1.1	The chief witness of the “vernacular” literature .....	1
1.1.2	Oral-formulaic style .....	14
1.2	Quaestio.....	32
1.2.1	Parallel research .....	32
1.2.2	My modern linguistic approach .....	35
<b>Chapter 2</b>	<b>The theory of Information Structure .....</b>	<b>39</b>
2.1	General information .....	39
2.2	My eclectic approach: “back to basics” .....	40
2.2.1	Obligatorily eclectic .....	41
2.2.2	Deliberately eclectic.....	41
2.3	Intonation/Information unit .....	42
2.3.1	Prosodic unit .....	43
2.3.2	Semantic unit .....	43
2.3.3	Syntactic unit .....	44
2.3.4	Parataxis .....	47
2.4	Topic/focus pair.....	47
2.4.1	Vs. referential givenness .....	48
2.4.2	Vs. discourse topic.....	51
2.4.3	Subclassifications .....	51
2.5	Discourse markers .....	52
2.5.1	Semantics.....	52
2.5.2	Syntax.....	56

2.5.3	Prosody .....	61
2.5.4	The topic switch marker .....	64
<b>Chapter 3</b>	<b>Corpus.....</b>	<b>65</b>
3.1	The LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry and its genres .....	65
3.2	The romance in the Greek tradition .....	67
3.2.1	Greek predecessors... ..	67
3.2.2	... but also western counterparts .....	68
3.3	The particular texts.....	69
3.3.1	Selection of the stories .....	70
3.3.2	Selection of versions and editions .....	76
<b>Chapter 4</b>	<b>The πολιτικός στίχος; a natural and flexible metre .....</b>	<b>81</b>
4.1	Natural rhythm .....	83
4.1.1	Metrical elasticity.....	83
4.1.2	Truly spoken word accent.....	88
4.1.3	Suitable iambic pattern .....	89
4.1.4	Rarity of vernacular prose .....	90
4.2	Much flexibility.....	91
4.2.1	Background information on clitics .....	92
4.2.2	First case study: verbal unit.....	100
4.2.3	Second case study: OCPs in the parallel versions of the <i>Chronicle of Morea</i> .....	110
<b>Chapter 5</b>	<b>Core analysis .....</b>	<b>125</b>
5.1	Intonation/Information unit .....	125
5.1.1	Introduction: the pointlessness of the concept “sentence” .....	125
5.1.2	Metrical arguments.....	127
5.1.3	Syntactico-semantic arguments .....	128
5.1.4	Secondary IU boundary and 3 IUs?.....	142
5.2	Topic/focus pair.....	146
5.2.1	Introduction: importance of topic/focus for Greek word order .....	146
5.2.2	Light verbs.....	159
5.2.3	Clitic doubling.....	168
5.3	Discourse markers .....	191
5.3.1	Introduction: P2 particles from DMs to mere formal fillers? .....	191
5.3.2	New DMs in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry?.....	203

5.3.3	Adverbial DMs .....	211
5.3.4	Verbal DMs .....	262
<b>Chapter 6</b>	<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>299</b>
6.1	A modern linguistic approach towards the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry as a whole .....	299
6.1.1	Information/Intonation unit .....	300
6.1.2	Topic/focus pair .....	301
6.1.3	Discourse markers .....	302
6.2	Corollary: linguistic foundation of the oral-formulaic style hypothesis .....	303
6.3	Further research: folk songs: continuity oral traditions? .....	305
<b>Bibliography</b> .....		<b>307</b>





# Chapter 1 Introduction: status quaestionis of the Late Medieval Greek πολιτικός στίχος poetry

This introductory chapter, which is conceived as a status quaestionis on the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry, is structured as follows: the first section (1.1) is built around two issues that have truly dominated the field of studies on the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry. First, this type of poetry has been granted the status of chief witness of the LMG *vernacular* literature (1.1.1). Secondly, the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry has been related to an oral tradition – it is nowadays said to have adopted an oral-formulaic style (1.1.2). This second characteristic will almost automatically lead us to the second section (1.2), which no longer concerns the status of the research field, but presents my own “quaestio” or research aim. This second part of my introductory chapter again consists of two subsections. Before introducing my own modern linguistic approach of the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry (1.2.2), I will point to an important parallel with a similar line of research on the Homeric poetry (1.2.1).

## 1.1 Status

### 1.1.1 The chief witness of the “vernacular” literature

Let me begin with the first characteristic of the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry that has dominated the research field, namely its status of chief witness of the *vernacular* literature from the 12<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup> centuries. When we have to situate the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry within the history of the Greek language, we can say that this type of

poetry belongs to literature which presents a clear break with the past. After an age-long classicising literary tradition, in which Classical Greek was the most-imitated and -emulated norm, Greek-speaking authors finally start throwing off the classical yoke and start writing in the vernacular in the LMG period (Rosenqvist 2007: 170). Although the vernacular literature really flourishes only from the 14<sup>th</sup> century on, with the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> century, i.e. the Palaiologan period, as its heyday, the emergence of Greek vernacular literature is usually placed in the 12<sup>th</sup> century (Hinterberger 2006: 1; cf. Marboeuf 2009: 7). The *Digenis Akritis*, which presumably dates from the 12<sup>th</sup> century, is generally considered our earliest extended literary text in vernacular Greek (Horrocks 2010<sup>2</sup>: 333).<sup>1</sup> This famous heroic romance is composed in the metre of the πολιτικὸς στίχος. Crucially, this will be the case for nearly all its vernacular descendants.

Indeed, the break-through of the vernacular tongue into literature is firmly associated with the use of the πολιτικὸς στίχος – vernacular *prose* is a peripheral phenomenon (Browning 1999<sup>2</sup>: 72f.). It thus seems that this fifteen-syllabic accentual metre has – finally – provided authors with a tool for writing in the vernacular. The connection between both is so inextricable, that Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>: 99) even calls the πολιτικὸς στίχος “the natural medium for vernacular narrative” (cf. *infra* 4.1). Hence, the πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry is especially renowned as our chief witness of the vernacular literature from the 12<sup>th</sup> to the 15<sup>th</sup> centuries.

Nonetheless, this title of honour is not without problems. In the next section (1.1.1.2), we will see that it has been challenged: the language of the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry cannot be called a *purely* vernacular idiom, as it incorporates ancient elements which have long died out in the naturally spoken language (though fewer variants than previously thought are truly “dead”, as we will see in an excursus). As such, it has even been labelled a “mixed” language (1.1.1.2.1). Closely connected with this is the problematisation of the conventional dichotomy between vernacular and learned literature and the plea for a view in terms of a continuum (1.1.1.2.2). However, we should first describe the traditional terminology and categorisation of LMG literature (1.1.1.1).

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. E. Jeffreys (1998); cf. *infra* 1.1.2.2.2 & 5.3.1.2.2.

### 1.1.1.1 Traditional terminology and categorisation

Traditionally, the LMG vernacular literature (δημώδης λογοτεχνία) is contrasted with the so-called learned literature (λόγια λογοτεχνία), which still takes – or attempts to take – Classical Greek as its linguistic model:

“Medieval Greek literature is conventionally thought of as consisting of two branches: works written in learned language as opposed to works written in registers closer to the vernacular” (Toufexis 2010: 107)

Vernacular literature, on the other hand, is written in an idiom close(r) to the contemporary spoken language, as the following statement testifies:<sup>2</sup>

“In Gegensatz zur sonstigen byzantinischen Literatur, die sich antikisierend und am attischen Griechisch orientierte, sind sie [the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος romances] in einer Sprachform verfaßt, die viele Ähnlichkeiten mit dem modernen neugriechischen Idiom aufweist” (Cupane 2003: 577)<sup>3</sup>

The term “vernacular” thus refers to a linguistic form in literary texts (cf. Hinterberger 2006: 4). It is important to emphasise this: the criterion to include texts in the “vernacular” category is purely linguistic – it has nothing to do with the content and/or public.<sup>4</sup>

As the quotation by Cupane illustrates, the dichotomy between learned and vernacular is often reflected in the terminology, for there is a tendency to use the term “(Late) Medieval” to refer to the vernacular, as opposed to the term “Byzantine” reserved for the learned language.<sup>5</sup> Note that this distinction is also expressed in the titles of the dictionaries of the period under investigation: while Kriaras’ “Λεξικό της μεσαιωνικής ελληνικής δημώδους γραμματείας” takes into account the vernacular<sup>6</sup>, Trapp’s “Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität” is dedicated to the learned language.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Joseph (1990: 5); Hinterberger (2006: 5); Horrocks (2010<sup>2</sup>: 318); Manolissou (2010: 18).

<sup>3</sup> As such, the LMG vernacular texts are sometimes also counted amongst the earliest manifestations of *Modern* Greek literature (cf. M. Jeffreys 1993b: 50: “Early Modern Greek”; E. Jeffreys 2013: 218).

<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, the term “popular literature” has been used in a content-based way, by Beck (1971) for instance (cf. Hinterberger 2000: 162 & 2001: 2-10).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Rollo (2008); Holton & Manolissou (2010); Hinterberger (2014).

<sup>6</sup> This well-known dictionary is to date unfinished: it stops at Π; cf. Soltic (2014c) for a notice on the most recently published part (volume 18: προβιδιάζω-ραβέντι).

<sup>7</sup> Nonetheless, there are exceptions: Tachibana (1994), for instance, speaks of “Byzantine Vernacular Greek”; cf. Smith (1996).

### 1.1.1.2 Problematisation

#### 1.1.1.2.1 “Mixed” language including vernacular and ancient elements

Even though the language of the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry is in every history book of Greek literature referred to with the label “vernacular”, the appropriateness of this term has been questioned, among others by Cupane (2003) and Hinterberger (2006). The title of both papers entails a question, which has still not been answered decisively: respectively “Wie volkstümlich ist die Byzantinische Volksliteratur?” and “How Should We Define Vernacular Literature?”.

The problem lies in the fact that the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry does not at all present a *purely* vernacular idiom. As a matter of fact, the poets include ancient (“learned”) forms, of which certain have long died out in the naturally spoken language. Therefore, the language of LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry has been labelled a mixed language:<sup>8</sup>

“The availability of ancient and modern alternatives in vocabulary, morphology, and syntax accounts for what is meant by the “mixed” character of medieval Greek” (Mackridge 2000: 134)

Modern elements occur side by side with ancient items and this results in a “non-standardised, so-called mixed or macaronic language incorporating vernacular and learned elements” (Toufexis 2008: 204). Tonnet (1993: 56) speaks of a “langue étant mixte”, Hinterberger (1993: 158) of a “Mischsprache” and Eideneier (1991: 26) of a “Mischstil”. The natural result of this mixed idiom is that an extremely high degree of linguistic variation is found in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry (cf. Toufexis 2008). In this context, Eideneier (2001: 51) speaks of “πολυτυπία” and Hinterberger (1993: 159f.) “herrschende Polymorphie” in the “volkssprachlichen metrischen Werken”.<sup>9</sup>

The linguistic variation can be found on all levels of grammar: orthography, phonology, morphology, lexicon and syntax (cf. Eideneier 2001; Hinterberger 2001). These resources of variation will all be sufficiently illustrated in my case study on the two parallel manuscripts of the *Chronicle of Morea* (cf. infra 4.2.3). However, I will already cite some typical variants, which must especially be sought on the level of morphology. Horrocks (2010<sup>2</sup>: 336), for instance, calls the morphological variation the most

---

<sup>8</sup> Note that in modern linguistics the term “mixed language” refers to something else, namely a language that arises through the fusion of usually two source languages (normally in bilingual situations).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Hinterberger (1993: 164): “Variantenreichtum”; Hinterberger (2007: 131).

noticeable type of variation when discussing the language of the *Digenis Akritis*: “Most obviously in evidence here is the parallel use of functionally equivalent morphology”. Moreover, in a recent talk David Holton told that in the first systematic grammar of LMG vernacular (currently still in preparation in Cambridge) the morphological section will be presented in synoptic tables ranging from “general” through “restricted” to “rare” in order to deal with the extreme morphological richness (workshop “Byzantine lexicography and the digital age” in Vienna; 30/11/2013).

Especially verbal morphology is a source of variation: “verbs display a variety of forms, ancient, modern and intermediary” (Papathomopoulos & E. Jeffreys 1996: lxxiii). A study on the *Chronicle of Morea* by Shawcross (2009: 170) confirms this: “there are more often than not alternative ways of expressing the same tense of the same verb”. A typical doublet found in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry is the ending of the third person plural: the inflectional endings -ουσι(ν)/-ασι(ν) alternate with -ουν/-αν (Browning 1999<sup>2</sup>: 81).<sup>10</sup> The former forms are considered ancient, whereas the latter are said to belong to the contemporary grammar.<sup>11</sup> In the aorist passive, there is variation between the ancient -θην and the modern -θηκα, so that forms with -κ- appear side by side with those without -κ- (Browning 1999<sup>2</sup>: 81).

However, (pro)nominal morphology measures up to verbal morphology. Papathomopoulos & E. Jeffreys (1996: lxxii) speak of “duplicate forms of nouns”. As regards the word “foot”, for instance, we find the variants πόδα, πόδι and ποδάρι. Beside Ancient Greek πατήρ and μήτηρ, we also find modern πατέρας and μήτερα (cf. Chábová 2010: 14). Many more examples can be found in Chábová (2010), who has recently devoted an article (unfortunately written in Czech) to morphological variants in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry.

### ***Excursus: more genuine variants than thought***

Not surprisingly, this mixed language has captured the imagination of many scholars: “The chief issue for historians of the Greek language, however, is that of the origin and development of the mixed language” (Horrocks 2010<sup>2</sup>: 218). In the past, it has often been assessed negatively. Dawkins (1939: 2), for instance, mentions that the language of the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry has even been called a “Graeco-barbaric mix” (cf. Lambert 1935: 28). According to Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>: 184), however, this view still has its adherents:

---

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Hinterberger (2001: 218); Horrocks (2010<sup>2</sup>: 319).

<sup>11</sup> Moreover, to the modern endings, an -ε can be added (Mackridge 2010: 582; Browning 1999<sup>2</sup>: 81); cf. *infra* 4.2.3.2.

“The weakness of Beck’s, Browning’s and Kriaras’ accounts lies in the assumption tacitly made by all three scholars of a negative evaluation of the mixed language of these texts”. With regard to the Escorial manuscript of the *Digenis Akritis*, Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>: 215) even observes that its language has been called a “hotchpotch”. Formerly, the ancient variants were mainly ascribed to *metrical* reasons: it was claimed that they were not part of the spoken language proper, but were mainly (preserved) due to pressure imposed by the metre of the πολιτικὸς στίχος (cf. infra 1.1.2.3.1).

The current majority view, however, is that more variants than previously thought are genuine, i.e. inherent to the contemporary spoken language of the time (at least in different regions in the Greek Empire). Indeed, many scholars admit that a great deal of the variants – including the allegedly ancient ones – must have belonged to the living language.<sup>12</sup>

While variation is of course inherent to any spoken language, the fact that the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry presents such a great deal of it should not come as a surprise. As mentioned, it is the first time that the vernacular was fully exploited in literary works. Accordingly, a codified vernacular standard is (still) absent:

“spoken medieval language must also have presented considerable variation, and it too must have contained archaisms and dialectisms; in fact, its degree of variation must have been greater than in modern languages since there was no formalization or standardization and no grammatical tradition in the vernacular” (Manolessou 2008: 73)<sup>13</sup>

Beside the absence of a codified vernacular standard, I will cite three other arguments which scholars have invoked to justify the thesis that a great deal of the linguistic variation found in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry is genuine. The first argument will be of a cultural nature: the big cities of the Byzantine Empire must have been a multicultural and thus multilingual melting-pot. The other two arguments will be linguistic ones: first, the (albeit very few) vernacular *prose* texts written in this period too show a high amount of variants; secondly, Modern Greek has remained a language with much linguistic variation.

---

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Mackridge (1990a: 125); Browning (1999<sup>2</sup>: 74); Hinterberger (2001: 215 & 235); E. Jeffreys (2011: 469).

<sup>13</sup> With regard to the spelling in particular, Moennig (2004: 218) remarks: “Normen griechischer Orthographie gibt es für das Altgriechische und für das Neugriechische, nicht aber für das byzantinische Griechisch”; cf. infra 4.1.1.2.

### *Multilingual melting pot*

To begin with, there is at the time a high degree of multicultural mobility. A consequence of this is that many people must have mastered another language beside Greek and must thus have been bilingual (or even trilingual) to a higher or lesser degree. The direct result of this second-language ability can be seen in my corpus, which includes literary adaptations of texts in foreign languages such as Old-French and Italian (cf. *infra* 3.2.2). Markopoulos (2009b: 245) has written an article on the LMG multilingualism:

“This study focuses on the eastern Mediterranean in the late medieval period (ca. 12<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> centuries) as a multiethnic, multilingual area. The impressive variety of people inhabiting this region resulted to [sic] the creation of a language contact area, where many languages could be heard and spoken”

Now, this melting-pot of different regional tongues might of course have contributed to the variation:

“I am inclined – along with many others – to suppose that there was in late Byzantine times a common spoken language in the capital and in urban areas linked with it, a common tongue in which a great many alternative forms, belonging historically to different dialects, were acceptable. Men from all over the Greek world mingled in Constantinople as they did nowhere else” (Browning 1999<sup>2</sup>: 82)<sup>14</sup>

This view is shared by Horrocks (2010<sup>2</sup>: 322):

“Though particular forms may originally have been characteristic of particular regions, mobility seems to have created a situation in which dialect mixture and free variation were the norm amongst city-dwellers of all classes” (Horrocks 2010<sup>2</sup>: 322)

Indeed, as Horrocks points out, dialectal variation can (still) not be identified in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry: there is no poem with the specific characteristics of any Modern Greek dialect (E. & M. Jeffreys 1986: 524). This fact has not only puzzled many researchers, but it has also hampered the attribution of the place of origin of the πολιτικός στίχος poems, as their language shows little regional variation or local character (Horrocks 2010<sup>2</sup>: 217).

---

<sup>14</sup> Note that the πολιτικός στίχος poets are often connected with the capital of Constantinople; cf. *infra* 3.3.

Take, for instance, the isogloss which nowadays sharply divides the Modern Greek landscape, namely the case which object clitic pronouns take to express the indirect object (cf. Kondosopoulos 1985; Ralli 2006). Standard Modern Greek, which is based on the southern dialects, has generalised the genitive case, whereas the northern dialects of Macedonia, Thrace and Thessaly nowadays use the accusative (cf. Browning 1999<sup>2</sup>: 9).<sup>15</sup> However, in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry, both cases are used side-by-side: “The accusative and genitive alternate freely in indirect object function” (Horrocks 2010<sup>2</sup>: 337; cf. also 284).

Only from the 15<sup>th</sup> century on and in non-literary texts, Lendari & Manolossou (2003) observe that preferences arise according to the location of the text (north: accusative vs. south: genitive).<sup>16</sup> Hence, Hinterberger speaks of the existence of “einem gemeinsamen, noch nicht nach Dialekten differenzierten sprachlichen Pool” (Hinterberger 1993: 168).

#### *In LMG prose too*

A second argument why a large part of the mix found in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry cannot solely be ascribed to metrical pressure is the fact that the variants are not confined to πολιτικός στίχος poetry: “το φαινόμενο της πολυτυπίας δεν περιορίζεται στα έμμετρα κείμενα” (Hinterberger 2001: 227). As a matter of fact, LMG vernacular *prose* texts, which are nonetheless very few in number (cf. *infra* 4.1.4), also present a great deal of variation and even contain entirely the same alternatives:<sup>17</sup>

“Weiters weisen auch zeitgenössische Prosatexte eine ähnliche morphologische Vielfalt und Variationsbreite wie metrische volkssprachliche Werke auf, ohne dass hier jedoch metrische oder auch rhetorische Belange für die Verwendung von Variationsformen ins Feld geführt werden könnten. Wir finden dieselben Alternativformen” (Hinterberger 1993: 165)<sup>18</sup>

This has also been observed by E. Jeffreys (2011: 472), who pertinently remarks that most of these prose texts belong to a slightly later period:

---

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Manolossou & Stamatis (2006); Horrocks (2010<sup>2</sup>: 384).

<sup>16</sup> However, this does not mean that the dialectal split has not taken place earlier (Lendari & Manolossou 2003).

<sup>17</sup> Moreover, the high amount of variation is not even limited to so-called vernacular literature: “the usage of a considerable number of alternative forms is a general characteristic of medieval Greek, not only of the vernacular, but also of the non-vernacular” (Hinterberger 2006: 4).

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Hinterberger (2001: 236); Horrocks (2010<sup>2</sup>: 336).



“In particular, an appreciation of the language of vernacular prose, admittedly largely post-Byzantine rather than Palaiologan, indicates the morphology and syntax found in the vernacular verse is not as unusual as once thought”

Think, for instance, back to the morphological variation concerning the verbal endings (ουσι(v)/-ασι(v) vs. -ουv/-αν; cf. supra 1.1.1.2.1). With regard to these, Hinterberger (1993: 168) notes: “In fast allen Prosatexten finden wir dasselbe Schwanken der Verbalendung der 3. Ps. Pl. Präsens Indikativ und Konjunktiv, sowie Konjunktif Aorist auf -ουσιv/-ωσιv und -ουv”. Therefore, Hinterberger (2001: 225) rejects the hypothesis that the allegedly ancient endings in -σι(v) are used only *metri causa*. Moreover, the fact that these endings have survived into modern dialects, supports the hypothesis that they must have been part of the living language (cf. immediately infra). Horrocks (2010<sup>2</sup>: 318) also corroborates this hypothesis:

“In medieval vernacular poetry, (...) there is fluctuation in the use of the two 3pl forms, much of it metrically motivated. But since even early prose pieces show parallel uncertainty, and Sofianós’ grammar (...) allows both forms in many instances, it seems that the variants were in parallel use in the later middle ages and into the modern period”

Moreover, it is often overlooked that quite a number of variants cannot have served merely metrical purposes, for they have exactly the same metrical value (i.e. same number of syllables and same stress). Πόδα and πόδι are an example of a doublet which is not metrically functional. This is pointed out by Kambylis in a discussion following M. Jeffreys’ (1987: 162) conference paper, in which the latter had just laid emphasis on the “ανάγκες του μέτρου”: “Es gibt aber auch Fälle, daß parallele Formen verwendet werden, wie z.B. Λαρίσου und Λαρίσης. Dort macht der Dichter von der Vielfalt der Sprache Gebrauch”.

### *Still in Modern Greek*

Finally, the contemporary linguistic situation in the Greek-speaking areas also suggests that a major part of the mix found in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry must have been genuine. Although no-one will ever call Standard Modern Greek a “macaronic” language, it has remained a language which contains much linguistic variation. Many doublets – especially morphological ones – survive in Standard Modern Greek. Specifically with regard to nominal morphology, Mackridge (1985) states that Standard Modern Greek presents a variety of alternative forms. More in general, he observes: “To the extent that SMGk [Standard Modern Greek] is based on common demotic, then, it is a mixture of features from various regions. But it is also a mixture of features from the

popular and the learned traditions” (Mackridge 2010: 571). Horrocks (2010<sup>2</sup>: 283) agrees with the idea of Standard Modern Greek as a mixed language:

“educated spoken usage of the late Byzantine and Ottoman periods, and much vernacular writing based on it, consistently involved a blend of learned/written and popular/spoken variants (...). Indeed, contemporary Modern Greek remains very much a mixed language, with a strongly vernacular base but with many elements derived from the learned tradition”<sup>19</sup>

Especially in comparison with other Modern European languages, the variation in Standard Modern Greek is eye-catching: “ή νεοελληνική γλώσσα, όπως καὶ ἡ ἀρχαία ἔχει σ' αὐτὸ μεγάλη ἐλευθερία, ἀντίθετα πρὸς ἄλλες νεώτερες εὐρωπαϊκές” (Stavrou 1992<sup>2</sup>: 40). According to Joseph (1987: 415), this should not surprise us – he even calls it an expected evolution. He relates the high amount of linguistic variation in Standard Modern Greek to the unique long literary tradition of the Greek language:<sup>20</sup>

“even ‘pure’ colloquial Greek, what has come to be called Demotic (Greek: δημοτική), at all times in the post-classical period has incorporated many historically anomalous and anachronistic elements; this is, of course, an expected development in a language with a long literary history available to speakers and writers at all times (compare the situation in India with regard to Sanskrit and the modern Indic languages, the Romance languages and Latin, and the Slavonic languages and Old Church Slavonic)”

In this context, a warning made by Hinterberger is in order: our modern perspective is perhaps misleading when investigating the mix between allegedly ancient and vernacular elements. As is logical, we approach the variants from a modern point of view, i.e. with the current form of Standard Modern Greek in our mind. However, the dichotomy ancient versus modern might not always be clear-cut: forms which have not survived into Standard Modern Greek are almost automatically assigned the status of ancient/learned, while these forms might still have been alive at the time – or in the words of Hinterberger (2006: 4):

“In my opinion, the phenomenon of the so-called mixed language is only apparently a problem (...) Many linguistic features of the medieval vernacular that today seem to be archaisms were probably features also of the living language”

---

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Janse & Joseph (2014).

<sup>20</sup> For an account of the history of the language controversy and the difficult settlement of the standard form of Greek, see Mackridge (2009).

A similar comment is made by Panajotakis in a discussion following M. Jeffreys' (1987: 162) conference paper:

“Wir müssen vorsichtig sein mit dem Ausdruck “Mischsprache”. Ein älterer Typus kann durchaus neben der sprachgeschichtlich jüngeren Form weiterbestehen. Eine genaue Unterscheidung zwischen einer einfach älteren und einer nicht mehr gebräuchlichen Form ist notwendig, bevor eine Sprachform als “Mischsprache” bezeichnet werden kann”

Indeed, we probably rely too much on our modern perspective: it is possible that at the same time two linguistic items are equally grammatically correct and available, but that we now consider one an archaism, precisely because it has disappeared in Standard Modern Greek.

As a matter of fact, this is proven by the fact that a number of variants no longer found in the standard language do survive in some of the (conservative) Modern Greek dialects. This objection has already been raised by Dawkins (1939: 30), who notes

“that it is not always easy to say at first sight what is a real barbarism and what is a genuine feature of the then state of the language, and that the key to our judgment must be the general history of Greek, a key often to be found not in the standard language, but in the local dialects, more especially, one may add, in the more conservative of these dialects”

As mentioned, Hinterberger (2006: 4) sees himself supported by dialectal evidence to prove that -ουσι(v) and -ασι(v) must have belonged to the spoken language of the time, as these endings are used today in Cypriot Greek. This is confirmed by Browning (1999<sup>2</sup>: 81):

“The language of the vernacular texts shows some uncertainty in regard to personal endings, forms which today either belong to different dialects or are found coexisting only in certain aberrant dialects used side by side. Thus in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural of present indicative and both subjunctives -ουv and -ουσι are found, in the corresponding tenses of imperfect and aorist indicative -αv and -ασι (and occasionally the purist form -ov), together with -οσαν”

Chatzidakis (1905: 37) was also convinced that -ουσι(v) is a living form in different parts of the Greek-speaking world; among others he lists the dialects of Crete and Cyprus.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Thumb (1910<sup>2</sup>: §213; fn 5): Cyprus, Crete, Mani, Aegean islands & Southern Italy: δένουσι(v) besides δένουv.

Another example is the infinitive. The infinitive no longer exists in Standard Modern Greek (e.g. Chatzikyriakidis 2010: 92). As such, the infinitive has long been thought to have died out in LMG. Nonetheless, this view has been revised due to dialectal proof: the usage of the infinitive in vernacular texts resembles that in Modern Greek dialects so closely, that Mackridge (1996) concluded that in certain linguistic contexts the infinitive was a feature of the living LMG language (cf. Joseph 2000; Hinterberger 2006).<sup>22</sup> As a consequence, we must conclude with Horrocks (2010<sup>2</sup>: 390) that “the limited infinitival usage of later medieval vernacular literature is not a learned/archaic feature but in fact offers a fair picture of the spoken norm of the period in the central regions”. In conclusion, it seems that this line of reasoning can be extrapolated to numerous other variants: many alternatives in the so-called mixed language of the πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry really coexisted in living speech – at least in different parts of the Greek-speaking world.

#### 1.1.1.2.2 Continuum from vernacular to learned

Nevertheless, even if a large part of the variants might have belonged to the contemporary spoken language, some ancient intruders were beyond any doubt “dead”. A typical example are the ancient particles, such as γάρ, γοῦν, δ(έ), μέν and οὔν, whose use I will extensively discuss later on (cf. *infra* 5.3.1). Another example from my corpus is the first person singular verb φημί (cf. *infra* 5.3.4.1.2.3). We can also mention the dative case, which no longer features in the normal spoken language, yet which still appears in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry – especially in fixed expressions, though, e.g. ἐν τούτῳ (cf. *infra* 5.3.3.1.5) (cf. Lendari & Manolessou 2003: 403; Trapp 1965).

Moreover, it makes no sense to deny that the alternatives – ancient as well as modern ones – must have served the πολιτικὸς στίχος poets well: Hinterberger (1993: 166) speaks of “die besondere Funktionalität der Alternativformen im Rahmen der metrischen Erfordernisse”. Accordingly, the variation remains more pronounced in the πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry than in prose, because variants are of course “extremely functional in 15-syllable verse” (Hinterberger 2006: 12f.). Since the most compelling metrical requirement posed by the metre of the πολιτικὸς στίχος is its length – every verse should count 15 syllables and stresses preferably lie on the even syllables (cf. *infra* 4.1.1.1) –, especially variants differing in number of syllables and in the position of the stress were exploited more freely in this type of poetry, e.g. disyllabic πόδα vs. three-

---

<sup>22</sup> There are two peripheral dialects, Pontic and Italiot (Griko, Grecia Salentina) where infinitival forms are still attested (Ralli 2006: 133, Sitaridou 2014 on Pontic; cf. Chatzikyriakidis 2010 on Grecia Salentina Greek).

syllabic ποδάρι. Another typical example is the strong personal pronoun: in my corpus, we find ἐμέ, ἐμένα and ἐμέναν as possible forms of the first person singular and ἐσέ, ἐσέν, ἐσέναν, σέν, σένα and σέναν as variants of the second person singular. In her edition of the romance *Livistros & Rodamni*, Lendari (2007: 107) says that “the choice of the particular form depends, in all probability, on the metrical position of the word”. On this point I agree with Lendari: I do not radically exclude that metrical considerations might have been decisive with regard to the particular choice for one of these (whether or not genuine) variants. As a result, the language of the πολιτικός στίχος poetry can hardly be called *purely* vernacular: it cannot be equated with the language spoken by the contemporary speakers of Greek.

However, the discussion has gone deeper than a problematisation of the term “vernacular” to describe the language of the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry: recently, the dichotomy vernacular versus learned LMG literature has as a whole been seriously problematised. Hinterberger (2006: 6ff.), for instance, made a list of linguistic criteria to distinguish vernacular from learned texts, such as the use of νά + finite verb (instead of the infinitive) and the absence of participles. However, he had to conclude that none of his criteria are truly decisive. As such, many current scholars favour an interpretation in terms of a *continuum* from more vernacular to more learned rather than maintaining the sharp dichotomy vernacular (“(Late) Medieval”) versus learned (“Byzantine”) literature; cf. Trapp’s (1993) article entitled “Learned and vernacular literature in Byzantium: dichotomy or symbiosis?”.<sup>23</sup> As such, statements such as the following are warp and woof in the literature on the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poems (cf. *infra* 3.3):

“The language [of *Livistros & Rodamni*] is more demotic than that of *Kallimachos*, but remains more purist than texts which are expressed in a traditional mixed language” (M. Jeffreys 1975a: 188)

In *Phlorios & Platzia Phlora* we find “fewer learned elements than we find in most of the original romances” (Beaton 1989: 135)

“the text that is considered closest to the vernacular, the *Chronicle of the Morea*” (Manolessou 2002: 125)

I have now sufficiently pointed out the terminological and conceptual difficulties entailed by the poetry’s label “vernacular”. We can pass to the second characteristic of

---

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Toufexis (2008: 213ff.); Karyolemou (2014).

the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry that has puzzled scholars, namely its oral-formulaic style.

## **1.1.2 Oral-formulaic style**

### **1.1.2.1 A glimpse at the hot debate**

Since the relation between the πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry and an oral tradition has caused heated discussions which have continued for many years, the secondary literature on this topic is enormous. As a result, I am forced to provide only a glimpse at the debate, of which a summary can be found in M. Jeffreys (1993a) and in Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>: 164-188). More precisely, I will provide a rough diachronic sketch of the different opinions: in a first stage scholars eagerly compared the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry with the Homeric epics, which are acknowledged to be the result of oral composition (1.1.2.3). Today, this parallel has been nuanced: the view that the πολιτικὸς στίχος poets are literate men who have deliberately adopted an oral-formulaic style is nowadays predominant (1.1.2.4). The term “oral” needs some clarification, though, for it might incorporate different senses: first, we should distinguish between oral medium and oral conception. Secondly, “oral” as used by Byzantinists does not reflect the term in our daily use, i.e. as a synonym of “spoken”, yet mainly refers to a stylistic issue, i.e. formulas (1.1.2.5). However, I will begin this section with a brief overview of the characteristics of the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry which have led to the association with an oral tradition (1.1.2.2).

### **1.1.2.2 Preliminary observations**

Under the textual characteristics (1.1.2.2.1), we should list formulas as well as metanarrative statements. Among the extratextual ones (1.1.2.2.2), we can cite the anonymous character of the texts and their fluid manuscript tradition. This last feature will lead me to an excursus on the editorial challenges posed by this type of texts.

#### **1.1.2.2.1 Textual**

##### *Formulas*

One of the most puzzling features of the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry is the high incidence of formulas, i.e. (quasi-)identical phrases which occur under the same metrical conditions to express a particular idea. Formulas are in general acknowledged to be typical of orally composed texts, under the idea that a store of formulaic

expressions greatly facilitates the composition of verses for oral poets. According to Parry and Lord formulas are even necessary ingredients of orally composed texts (cf. Bakker 1999: 36). With regard to the πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry, they occur both within one and the same text and across the corpus of poems as a whole. A famous example of a formula is μικροί τε καὶ μεγάλοι:

- (1) ὅλοι νὰ τὸν ἀκούγουσιν, μικροί τε καὶ μεγάλοι (LR 635)<sup>24</sup>  
“all will listen to him, small ones and big ones”
- (2) γέροντες, νέοι, ἅπαντες, μικροί τε καὶ μεγάλοι (LR 2111)  
“old men, young men, all, small ones and big ones”
- (3) καὶ πᾶσα πόλις καὶ λαός, μικροί τε καὶ μεγάλοι (AB 1877)  
“and the whole city and the people, small ones and big ones”

It is the Jeffreys who have done pioneering work on formulas in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry. In his PhD dissertation, M. Jeffreys (1972) found out that the percentage of formulaic half-verses rises to more than 30% in the *Chronicle of Morea*. E. & M. Jeffreys also analysed the formulaic density of other πολιτικὸς στίχος poems, such as *Imberios & Margarona* and the *War of Troy* (e.g. E. & M. Jeffreys 1971 & 1979; cf. infra 3.3). Especially the latter, which is a literary adaptation of an Old French original, presents an interesting case: E. & M. Jeffreys discovered that the formulas in the Greek version are not based on the French ones, as the formulas in the *War of Troy* generally do not have a precise equivalent in the French version: “the frequent use of a formula in the Greek is not prompted by the nature of the French text” (Papathomopoulos & E. Jeffreys 1996: 126; cf. E. & M. Jeffreys 1986: 532). The formulas are thus typical of the Greek tradition.

#### *Metanarrative statements*

The πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry not only abounds with formulas, it also contains many references to an oral storyteller (= authorial self-references) and to an attendant

---

<sup>24</sup> The abbreviations of πολιτικὸς στίχος poems will be accounted for in chapter 3. Translations are my own unless otherwise indicated. Not surprisingly, English translations of the most LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poems are still lacking; cf. infra 3.3. However, I owe a debt of gratitude to Lurier (1964), who has undertaken the enormous task of translating the *Chronicle of Morea*. His translation is very useful, for it follows the Greek text verse per verse. The same applies to the translation of the *Digenis Akritis* by E. Jeffreys (1998), from which I have taken over a phrase here and there. With regard to the Ancient and (post-)Classical Greek works (Homer, Plato, the New Testament, etc.), I will take the translation from *Perseus* (which uses the Loeb editions).

audience, as well as references to the act of telling and listening: “nous retrouvons très fréquemment ces expressions qui renvoient régulièrement à l’acte de parole: ὥσάν σε τὸ ἀφηγοῦμαι, καθὼς σε τὸ ἐπροεῖπα, *comme je vais te le raconter, comme je viens de te le dire*” (Marboeuf 2009: 26). Note the first person (storyteller) and second person (audience) references in the following verses:

(4) Οὐκ ἤμπορῶ μακρολογεῖν, λέγω σας ἐν συνόψει (BT 8561)  
“I cannot extend, I tell you briefly”

(5) πᾶσα ψυχὴ καλοθελῆς, ἐρωτοπαιδευμένη,  
“every empathic soul, educated in love,”  
εὐγενικοχαρίτωτος, φιλέρωτος καρδία,  
“(every) noble and longing heart”  
τώρα μετὰ μὲν ἅς ἐλθῇ καὶ μετ’ ἐμὲν ἅς κάτση. (LR 10-12)  
“let him now come to me and let him sit with me”

In the prologue of *Velthandros & Chrysandza*, the audience is even directly addressed (and flattered) by means of the vocative ὠραῖοι πάντες:

(6) Δεῦτε, προσκατερήσατε μικρόν, ὠραῖοι πάντες,  
“Come, wait a moment, all beautiful people”  
θέλω σας ἀφηγήσασθαι λόγους ὠραιотάτους (VC 1-2)  
“I will tell you very beautiful words”

These so-called metanarrative statements have also been associated with an oral tradition: they are traditionally said to be the “evidence of the intention of oral delivery” (Anaxagorou 1998: 136f.).

#### 1.1.2.2.2 Extratextual

##### *Anonymous*

Another – extratextual – feature of the πολιτικός στίχος poetry which has been linked with orality is the anonymous character of the texts. Of none of the πολιτικός στίχος poems included in my corpus the author is known by name (cf. *infra* 3.3).<sup>25</sup> This feature too is recognised as a characteristic of an oral tradition: “Diese Anonymität ist für die mündlich überlieferte Dichtung kennzeichnend” (Eideneier 1983a: 135).

<sup>25</sup> The only exception is *Kallimachos & Chrysorroï*, but I have excluded this text from my corpus; cf. *infra* 3.3.1.



### *Fluid manuscript tradition*

Finally, most LMG πολιτικός στίχος poems have a text tradition which is completely alien to Ancient Greek literature. The texts survive in a number of manuscripts which differ to such an extent that it is “impossible to collate the readings into one primary version by conventional editorial principles” (E. Jeffreys 2011: 469). Agapitos (2006a: 105) calls this “ἡ ἀνεπάρκεια τῆς στεμματικῆς μεθόδου”. Hence, we best speak of different “versions”, which all have their own validity and require a different editorial treatment (Moennig 2004: 217; Eideneier 1983a: 140).

A rather extreme example is found in the manuscript tradition of our earliest extended literary text in the vernacular, the *Digenis Akritis* (cf. supra 1.1.1). This famous heroic romance has been preserved in two important manuscripts: the Escorial (E) manuscript and the Grottaferrata (G) manuscript. These are usually typecast as follows: “the redactor of the G-version strived [sic] to Atticize on the one hand and that [sic] of the E-version to vulgarize on the other” (Trapp 1993: 121; cf. Karyolemou 2014: 40).<sup>26</sup> However, neither of the two represents a pure idiom – they are both rather typical manifestations of the mixed language of the πολιτικός στίχος poetry (cf. supra 1.1.1.2.1).

The fact that the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poems do not represent fixed texts has also been linked with orality issues, for a fluid manuscript tradition might be seen as the result of oral transmission: the different versions of each story then reflect separate oral performances: “Certainly, the fact that some romances exist in different versions corroborates the hypothesis that they were intended for recitation” (Betts 1995: xxx; cf. infra 1.1.2.5.1.1).<sup>27</sup>

However, it is presently agreed that a major role should be ascribed to the attitude of the copyists: when copying Ancient Greek texts, scribes are much more strict and rigorous than when dealing with vernacular pieces, in which case their approach seems to have loosened: “It is immediately clear from the array of variant readings in the surviving manuscripts that the verbal accuracy expected in the copying of classical or learned texts did not extend to such work” (Horrocks 2010<sup>2</sup>: 217).<sup>28</sup> Thus, the copyists do

---

<sup>26</sup> The precise relationship between E and G and their relationship to the “Urfassung”, as well as the question of which nature this original text was, have caused heated discussions, but are of no concern here. For further bibliography, see Beaton & Ricks (1993). Alexiou (1985) in particular has fervently defended E as the most original version.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Eideneier (1987); Smith (1987).

<sup>28</sup> Cf. M. Jeffreys (1993b); Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>: 102).

not hold a word-for-word attitude towards vernacular literature, but maintain a “liberal” copying process.

### *Excursus: editorial challenge*

No matter what the precise explanation of the fluid manuscript tradition is, this situation poses a serious challenge for editors. Editorial techniques concerning LMG vernacular texts have been problematised (cf. the discussions in Eideneier, Moennig & Toufexis 2001 and Holton et al. 2005). As for the *Digenis Akritis*, E. Jeffreys (1998) has recently edited E and G separately, because these two versions without any doubt “represent separate reworkings”. However, not all editors of LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος texts adhere to this practice: depending on the nature and the number of (the differences between) the versions, they might take other editorial decisions (cf. infra 3.3.2). As a matter of fact, the editorial solutions which have been proposed range from an eclectic edition (e.g. Kriaras 1955), a combination of manuscripts according to the editor’s understanding of the author’s language (e.g. Agapitos 2006a), an edition based on a conventional Lachmannian stemma (e.g. Papathomopoulos & E. Jeffreys 1996), a synoptic presentation of the various versions (e.g. Bakker & Van Gemert 1988), a sequential presentation of the separate versions (e.g. E. Jeffreys 1998; Moennig 2004) to the edition of a single manuscript (e.g. Lendari 2007) (cf. infra 3.3.2). The ideal (if any) solution is still wanting, as E. Jeffreys (2013: 220) has very recently observed:

“a consensus has yet to emerge over appropriate editorial solutions (...) if there is a consensus of any sort it is that each text has to be treated as a special case and there are no universally valid solutions”<sup>29</sup>

Although there is an increasing number of respectable editions, this remains a painful area in the field of LMG vernacular studies. Manollessou (2008: 70), for instance, raises the need of new editions for linguists: “if the language of literary texts is to be studied thoroughly and reliably, new editions/transcriptions of the texts are necessary, not for the general reader, but for the linguist”. Manollessou (2008: 68) considers this warning indispensable, because the reliance on editions has become a common practice, as she

---

<sup>29</sup> Cf. E. Jeffreys’ lecture “O tempora, o mores! changing fashions in editorial practice” at the workshop “Middle and Late Byzantine poetry: text and context” in Vienna (04/07/2014). Perhaps, the digital revolution can show its uses in this respect too...

criticises: “There is virtually no linguistic research involving Medieval Greek that does not take as its base critical editions of literary texts”.<sup>30</sup>

Until the publication of new editions, however, linguists should in my opinion not stand by doing nothing: descriptions of the language – especially of little-studied peculiarities – might actually *help* future editors. We should of course take care to keep the manuscripts near at hand (and at the very least conduct random checks), to exclude with certainty the possibility of editorial interventions (cf. *infra* 3.3.2). In the course of this dissertation, I will point to the existence of a number of linguistic “peculiarities” which have up to now remained unnoticed by Byzantinists (including editors): corrective afterthoughts (cf. *infra* 5.1.3.3), (fossilised) discourse markers (cf. *infra* 5.3.4.2.2), hanging topic left-dislocations (cf. *infra* 5.2.3.4.1) and repair right-dislocations (cf. *infra* 5.2.3.4.2). Since these phenomena all involve a certain lack of grammatical agreement, they risk being “corrected”, given the *pruritus emendandi* of many editors. The postponed position of the ancient particles is also a good example of a linguistic trait which might seem curious at first sight, but which actually turns out to perfectly normal (cf. *infra* 4.2.2).

To sum up, all the above characteristics of the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry, i.e. formulas, metanarrative statements, anonymity and a fluid manuscript tradition, testify in some way to (a kind of) orality. The interpretation of this “orality” has evolved in due course.

### 1.1.2.3 Early days: from oral composition to literary plagiarism

#### 1.1.2.3.1 Second Homer: oral composition and *Kunstsprache*

In the early days of LMG studies, the high incidence of formulas found in the πολιτικός στίχος poetry reminded enthusiastic scholars of the formulaic language of the Homeric epics, which are also composed in a metre, i.e. the dactylic hexameter. The Homeric epics have been acknowledged to be the result of age-old oral composition. This led to an equation of both traditions:

“L’identité de ces vers (...) a fait supposer une certaine confrérie des poètes, comparable, peut-être, aux rhapsodes des temps homériques” (Hesseling 1938: 378)

---

<sup>30</sup> Wahlgren (2002: 294), on the other hand, himself an editor of medieval Greek texts, takes a more moderate stance: “it has often been claimed that we do not yet have adequate editions of Byzantine texts. I think we have. First, it is a mistake to believe that most new editions will change the picture to any extent”.

“It is quite natural that the oral theory, as it is called, is known best to classicists, who have been examining Homer from that point of view since the days of Milman Parry. More recently the theory has attracted the attention of medievalists” (Trypanis 1963: 1)

In his survey of Greek poetry from Homer to Seferis, Trypanis (1981: 535ff.) also presents the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poems as the products of an oral composition.

Moreover, the presence of formulas was not the only (apparent) resemblance with Homer. In his early works, M. Jeffreys insisted on a double parallel with the Homeric language: he saw not only a similarity in the formulas, but also in the above discussed mixed language (cf. M. Jeffreys 1975a: 177). Indeed, the language of the Homeric epics too has been called a mixture: its basis is an archaic version of Ionic (Old-Ionic), yet interspersed with elements from other dialects, such as Aeolic and Mycenaean (Kirk 1985). It has been acknowledged that the archaic forms in the Homeric epics are preserved for metrical reasons, namely to facilitate the poet’s composition in the straitjacket of the dactylic hexameter. Some Homeric forms even seem to have been created out of metrical necessity: “Die Gewöhnung hat viele dieser zunächst aus metrischen Not geborenen Formen legitimiert” (Meister 1921: 242). Accordingly, Meister (1921: 232) states that “Der Einfluß des Hexameters auf die Bildung der epischen Sprache ist groß”. That is why the language of the Homeric epics is traditionally known as a *Kunstsprache*: “Homer’s language is a traditional *Kunstsprache* for poetic expression, based on the metrical shape of the hexameter” (M. Jeffreys 1975a: 177).<sup>31</sup>

Insisting on the apparent analogies, the language of the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry has also been labelled a *Kunstsprache*: “the mixture of regional dialects, and of spoken with written vocabulary and grammar, represents an art-language or *Kunstsprache*” (Beaton 1996<sup>2</sup>: 184; cf. Eideneier 1983a: 132). Pursuing this line of reasoning *in extremis*, M. Jeffreys has once uttered the suspicion that the language is to a certain extent (de)formed after the πολιτικός στίχος pattern. In his view, the πολιτικός στίχος must have had such a formative power over the language that it has led to the creation of new variants which nicely fit in the metrical pattern: “κατά την γνώμη μου, η γλώσσα των κειμένων αυτών (...) αποτελεί σύστημα για την παραγωγή του δεκαπεντασύλλαβου” (M. Jeffreys 1987: 142; cf. M. Jeffreys 1972). In the following statement, M. Jeffreys (1975a: 178) even literally expresses the comparability with the Homeric *Kunstsprache*:

---

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Meister (1921); Janse (1998a & 2012).

“This [the πολιτικὸς στίχος] is the metre, in my opinion, which has been as influential in shaping the mixed language of demotic poetry as was the hexameter in controlling the Homeric language”. Nowadays, however, M. Jeffreys has readjusted his opinion and has weakened the analogy with Homer (cf. *infra* 1.1.2.4).

#### **1.1.2.3.2 Literary borrowings**

The extreme point of view that the Homeric and the LMG tradition can be paralleled resulted in an equally extreme reaction, defended vigorously by Spadaro in a series of articles (1978; 1987 & 1993). He attributes the high occurrence of formulas in the πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry to purely literary plagiarism: the artistic level of the πολιτικὸς στίχος poets is so low, that they copy each other's verses. Thus, according Spadaro (1978: 9), the formulaic phraseology has been developed by a plagiaristic school of poets:

“E' evidente, infatti, che i poeti della letteratura greca medievale in lingua volgare si sentivano legati da uno stesso indirizzo poetico, appartenevano ad una stessa scuola poetica, per così dire, e quindi subivano, ovviamente, il fascino delle opere precedenti, alle quali spesso si ispiravano e dalle quali attingevano... oltre che motivi, emistichi, versi interi, insomma tutto quel formulario che all'occorrenza utilizzavano con molta comodità e grande vantaggio, sebbene a scapito dell'originalità”

#### **1.1.2.3.3 Scribal interference**

A third yet minor hypothesis to explain the formulaic nature of the πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry was formulated by Bakker & van Gemert (1988), who prefer an account in terms of scribal interpolation/interference and contamination: when the same copyist has written out more than one vernacular text in the same manuscript, he will tend to repeat verses originally belonging to one text when copying another (cf. Beaton 1996<sup>2</sup>: 165ff.).

#### **1.1.2.4 Nowadays: oral-formulaic style hypothesis**

##### **1.1.2.4.1 Written composition**

Today, the *communis opinio* can be summarised as follows: first, the intervention of copyists in the transmission of the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry is not in doubt, but can account for only a small proportion of the shared formulaic elements (cf. Beaton 1996<sup>2</sup>: 169f.). Thus, the main explanation lies elsewhere: it is nowadays agreed that the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry is not the direct product of an oral tradition and is thus not

orally composed, but that it is the *written* work of literate poets – poets on whose style an oral tradition must have had some influence, though.

What was crucial, was the insight that the presence of formulas should not necessarily be taken as proof of oral composition and not even as evidence of oral performance. As one of the first, Franz Bäuml (1984) has come to this conclusion after studying to the German *Nibelungenlied*: “a written text, no matter how high its formulaic density, is not necessarily orally composed, nor need it ever to have been part of the oral tradition” (Bäuml 1984: 37; cf. Beaton 1996<sup>2</sup>: 179f.). Indeed, formulas can be easily imitated in purely *written* compositions, in which case they work in a different way: they are not truly functional (cf. Beaton 1996<sup>2</sup>: 179; cf. Bakker 1997b: 285). As such, “their formerly oral formulism has become a matter of style” (Bäuml 1984: 42).

Similar conclusions have been drawn with regard to the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry. The prevailing opinion is expressed by Sifakis (2001: 67):

“The style markers of orality that can be identified in the works of Medieval Greek, so-called vernacular, poetry are not to be taken as indications of an earlier phase of oral composition of such works – for which there is not a shred of evidence – but as signs of the style of traditional folk poetry adopted, to a greater or lesser degree, by literate poets”

By contrast, the Homeric epics, including their formulas, are a product of “primary orality”, i.e. of a preliterate society, as Papathomopoulos reminds us in a discussion following M. Jeffreys’ (1987: 163) conference paper, in which the latter had just emphasised the parallel between Homer and the *Chronicle of Morea*:

“Es wird die Zeit vor der Niederschrift der homerischen Epen mit der Zeit vor der Abfassung der ‘Chronik von Morea’ verglichen. Es besteht aber ein großer Unterschied: vor Homer gab es keine Schrift, die zur Niederschrift solcher Werke geeignet gewesen wäre”

Conversely, the orality found in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry clearly belongs to “secondary orality”, i.e. “a more deliberate and self-conscious orality, based permanently on the use of writing and print” (Ong 1982: 136). Consequently, the analogy with Homer has been weakened. As mentioned above, M. Jeffreys too has readjusted his opinion, the immediate cause being the insight that more variants than previously thought must have been alive at the time (cf. supra 1.1.1.2.1):

“Suggestions that this phenomenon might have a parallel in the mixed Homeric language, preserved by metrical pressures, were mentioned in the initial proposals for an oral background to the fourteenth-century texts (M. Jeffreys

1973: 193). These proposals assumed too much regularity in the spoken language of the time which contained many variations” (E. Jeffreys 2011: 472)

Agapitos & Smith (1992: 46; fn 98) warned us from the beginning that we cannot simply transpose the label *Kunstsprache* from the Homeric epics to the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry:

“The theory of an artificial language as a result of a long epic tradition was fair enough in the case of Homer, and no one would question that today (...) But it is a wholly different thing to regard the vernacular in the romances as a ‘Kunstsprache’, as the ‘proud’ creation of the Byzantine poets”

Hinterberger (1993: 165 & 2001: 227) also fervently rejects the interpretation of the language of the πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry as a *Kunstsprache*.

Thus, it might have become clear that we cannot simply equate (the context, formulas and mixed language of) the Homeric poetry and the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry. However, no one is to be found who would still claim this. As a matter of fact, the oral-formulaic style hypothesis has been widely accepted in the field of LMG, so that there nowadays exists:

“a tacit acceptance that the stylistic features and peculiarities of this group of late Byzantine verse texts are best explained against a background of orally composed and orally disseminated poetry” (E. Jeffreys 2011: 470)

In this context, we must also interpret the above mentioned metanarrative statements (cf. supra 1.1.2.2.1). Rather than being authentic testimonies of oral composition or of oral performance, the references to an oral storyteller/audience simply belong to the style which the πολιτικὸς στίχος poets adopt: while writing, the poets attempt to evoke a live oral composition, i.e. “mettre textuellement en scène une fiction orale” (Marboeuf 2009: 29).<sup>32</sup> According to Shawcross (2009: 180), the metanarrative statements are part of a strategy to insist upon the “delineation of a fictional communicative situation” (Shawcross 2009: 180; cf. Anaxagorou 1998: 64f.). They are thus means to “compensate for the loss by simulating, within the parameters of the text itself, the establishment and maintenance of a bond typical of orality” (Shawcross 2009: 157).<sup>33</sup> This is confirmed by Marboeuf (2009: 26), who emphasises that the metanarrative statements in the

---

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Agapitos (1991: 74-128); Anaxagorou (1998: 64f.); Shawcross (2009: 157ff.).

<sup>33</sup> Shawcross (2010) has even devoted an article to the voice of the storyteller in the *Chronicle of Morea*; it is entitled “Listen, all of you, both Franks and Romans”: The Narrator in the Chronicle of Morea”.

*Chronicle of Morea* are not limited to the introduction and the end of the story, but occur throughout the whole text.

#### 1.1.2.4.2 No other vernacular models than oral songs/oral narratives

The question now arises why these poets adopted an oral-formulaic style. “Because of the lack of literary *written* models in the vernacular” has been the most frequent answer:

“it is highly probable that during the twelfth to sixteenth centuries, when the modern language was first tentatively being exploited for literary purposes, the oral traditions of that time exercised a formative influence on writers who had no other models of poetic composition in the vernacular on which to draw” (Beaton 1986: 115)

“those who wished to write in a more ‘oral’ variety of Greek had only song that they could recognise as an artistically organised, albeit unwritten, use of language” (Mackridge 1990a: 125)

So, it seems that the poets sought for inspiration in the Greek tradition of oral songs or even oral narratives.

#### *Oral songs*

The postulation of a (simultaneous) tradition of oral songs, which must have served as a model for the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry and to which both poets and copyists must have had recourse, certainly becomes plausible if one looks at the present-day situation in Greece: many folk songs have survived and these are nearly all composed in the πολιτικὸς στίχος (cf. *infra* 4.1.3). The πολιτικὸς στίχος is thus the common denominator of the modern folk songs and the written LMG poetry: Holton (1990: 197) speaks of “the powerful connecting factor of the ‘political’ verse, and its inseparability from the oral tradition of folk poetry”. In this context, it should be noted that Peri (2012: 125ff.), a metrical expert, emphasises the interference between the structure of the written πολιτικὸς στίχος and the πολιτικὸς στίχος of the songs:

“Insomma il problema prioritario dal mio punto di vista non è quello di stabilire se il decapentasilabo nasce dal versus quadratus, dal tetrametro, dall’unione di due ottonari ovvero da una molteplicità di fonti. Il problema è vedere innanzi tutto



come, quando e perché l'interferenza metrico-musicale si compagina in questa struttura" (Peri 2012: 156)<sup>34</sup>

Although these Modern Greek folk songs have only been collected and published from the 19<sup>th</sup> century on<sup>35</sup>, some scholars have proposed a certain connection between the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry and the modern folk poetry. A few have even dared to argue in favour of a *continuing* oral tradition (cf. infra 5.1.4 & 6.3).<sup>36</sup> Due to the lack of hard proof, however, such suggestions are usually formulated in vague and cautious – often even questioning – terms; I have selected a few statements to give an impression:

"There can be no doubt that elements of the folk-song tradition go far back into the Byzantine era" (Horrocks 2010<sup>2</sup>: 407)

"Kann man schließlich in diesen sich als schriftliche Werke präsentierenden Erzählungen [LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry] eine mündliche poetische Tradition aufspüren, die noch heute im neugriechischen Volkslied lebt?" (Cupane 2003: 581)

"Die „poetische Syntax“ der byzantinischen Versdichtungen in der Volkssprache entspricht der von Volksdichtung, wie sie uns in etwa noch im neugriechischen Volkslied vorliegt. Dazu gehört generell der Stil, die Struktur und das Versmaß genauso wie der einzelne Formelhalbvers" (Eideneier 1983a: 133; cf. also 148)

"there is good evidence for believing that the songs first systematically collected in the nineteenth century and still sung today come of a tradition which had lasted at least since that time [fall of Constantinople in 1453]" (Beaton 1980: 1)

The question how far back this tradition of oral songs can be traced, can only be answered in even more hypothetical terms. Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>: 187), for instance, simply speaks of "previous" oral poetry in the vernacular. In an earlier article, he is less vague, though:

"there is a wealth of circumstantial evidence for the existence and wide popularity of the song tradition from the fifteenth century onwards (...) Certainly

---

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Peri (2012: 127): "tutti gli esempi piu antichi del decapentasilabo (...) sono cantati".

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Beaton (1986: 115); Horrocks (2010<sup>2</sup>: 406). The tradition seems to have lasted up to the middle of the last century: "Ancora oggi qualunque greco conosce a memoria brani popolari cantati, spesso è in grado di eseguirli (non importa se con maggiore o minore abilità) e sicuramente questa competenza musicale era ben più alta nel passato, diciamo fino alla seconda guerra mondiale che segna il tracollo della tradizione orale" (Peri 2012: 140).

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Eideneier (1983: 133; fn 2).

after the fifteenth century there are clear signs that literary writers were aware of folk songs such as we know today and were to a greater or lesser extent influenced by them in their writings” (Beaton 1980: 87)

M. Jeffreys (1975a: 178) has even hinted at the existence of such a tradition of oral songs before the 12<sup>th</sup> century:<sup>37</sup>

“In that case, there must have been a lively tradition of oral political verse before the twelfth century, when its vernacular form first makes its appearance in surviving texts”

#### *Oral narratives*

Moreover, E. & M. Jeffreys have hypothesised an oral narrative tradition (beside the sung one), which has now been lost:

“That tradition [of songs resembling Modern Greek folk-songs] will have continued uninterrupted till this day. But if, as this paper suggests, the EMG [Early Modern Greek] texts of the fourteenth century owe several formal characteristics to a narrative oral tradition of that time, we have to accept a second hypothetical tradition as well (...) Not only must we support the early appearance of the ballads (...); we must also accept a simultaneous tradition with different characteristics of a narrative type” (M. Jeffreys 1993b: 62f.)<sup>38</sup>

Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>: 224) makes a similar suggestion:

“The first step (...) is bound to be the search for precedents (...) In such a situation it would be remarkable if these writers had not turned to the oral narrative poetry that, in some form, must have existed around them”

Moennig (2004: 156) also speaks of a “mündlichen Erzähltradition” as an inspiration source of the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry.

---

<sup>37</sup> Cf. E. & M. Jeffreys (p.c. 26/06/2011): “If a link is to be considered, what might it be? A simple conclusion would be that Modern Greek folk-song is the direct descendant of a written Byzantine genre, itself constructed on patterns found in late antique rhetorical handbooks. This seems to me extremely unlikely, as well as ideologically horrific. Much more likely is the thought that there were in the twelfth century oral, probably vernacular poems with ballad characteristics which could play two roles in the skeleton history of the dekapentasyllabos”.

<sup>38</sup> E. & M. Jeffreys (1986: 538) see themselves supported by narrative songs in Crete and Cyprus, which can, in their opinion, be compared directly to the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poems.

The postulation of such a lost oral narrative tradition is not too far-fetched if we take a look at the wider picture: “all over Europe, roughly from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries, narrative-type poetry was giving way to ballads” (M. Jeffreys 1993b: 62f.). Indeed, during the middle ages, the influence of similar oral traditions can be identified in other European vernacular literatures:<sup>39</sup>

“This study has accepted the now widely held view that medieval texts, though literate in nature, contain an “oral remnant” left from the period of oral composition and transmission” (Brinton 1996: 265)

This view has thus finally also been accepted with regard to the LMG situation:

“To judge by discussions at the last meeting of Neograeca Medii Aevi (Ioannina, 2005) a consensus has emerged that a background of oral composition and performance does indeed lie behind much of medieval Greek (Byzantine) literature in the vernacular, as is also true of other European literatures (on which there is a large bibliography, demonstrating a similar controversy and consensus to which medieval Greek now belatedly conforms)” (E. Jeffreys 2013: 220; fn 11)

#### 1.1.2.4.3 Fully conscious

It should be noted that Beaton’s (1996<sup>2</sup>: 191ff.) interpretation of the oral-formulaic style of the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry slightly differs from that of the others, although both views do not necessarily exclude each other. Rather than emphasising the lack of written literary vernacular models as the driving force for including elements from an oral tradition, Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>: 191ff.) gives a more positive account for the adoption of an oral-formulaic style. Beaton is convinced that the poets creatively attempt to achieve a new means of literary expression or even a new genre by inserting formulas and the like. Thus, Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>: 188) actually grants more credit to the πολιτικός στίχος poets: he considers them skilled craftsmen (which stands in sharp contrast with the talentless imitators whom Spadaro speaks of; cf. supra 1.1.2.3.2).

However, whether the poets’ underlying intentions are more positively interpreted (the poets *choose* to use oral elements in an attempt to create a new genre) or rather negatively assessed (the poets *see themselves forced* to rely on oral precedents, their only available models in the vernacular, in order to justify their writings), the adoption of an

---

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Beaton (2004). For other medieval European vernacular literatures and their relation with “orality”, cf. Crosby (1936 & 1938); Ong (1984); Fleischman (1985); Zumthor (1989); Lindahl (1995), whose article has the revealing title: “The Oral Undertones of Late Medieval Romance”; Reichl (2011).

oral-formulaic style should definitely be considered a *conscious* choice on the part of the poets. The allusions or “nods” – as Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>: 179) calls them – towards an oral tradition are thus fully intentional.

In conclusion, we can say that the oral-formulaic style hypothesis has today been accepted in the field of LMG: the oral style markers, of which the formulas are the representatives par excellence, are deliberately adopted by self-conscious poets in a literate culture.

#### 1.1.2.5 Problematic term “oral”

However, the term “oral” should be more clearly defined, for it incorporates different senses (a fact which is often overlooked by Byzantinists). First, we should distinguish between oral medium and oral conception (1.1.2.5.1). Secondly, “oral” cannot be simply equated with “spoken” (1.1.2.5.2). As such, the next subsection attempts at replying to the objection raised by Bakker (1999: 29): “what exactly does ‘oral’ mean?”...

##### 1.1.2.5.1 Medium vs. conception

A first theoretical distinction we should make when using the term “oral” is between medium and conception. Medium refers to the way in which language is *physically realised*: either by writing (graphically) or by speaking (phonically). On the other hand, conception refers to the way in which the discourse is *linguistically conceived*. A conceptionally oral text reflects “orally based thought” (Ong 1982: 36f.). Especially the work of Oesterreicher is clarifying with regard to the distinction between medium and conception:

“Consequently, the term orality in the title of this article has nothing to do with the phonic realization of language [= medium]. Rather, it is used to characterize the style or the mode of expression. Orality refers to the linguistic conception of discourse, as I prefer to call it. As we shall see, this conceptional aspect of language must be strictly differentiated from the medium aspect of language. The overall distinction between linguistic medium and linguistic conception has been made by several linguists, although their definitions vary to some degree” (Oesterreicher 1997: 191)<sup>40</sup>

Consequently, rather than maintaining a simple mono-dimensional dichotomy (oral vs. written), we should distinguish the medial sense of “oral” from the conceptional one. In

---

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Koch & Oesterreicher (1985); Bakker & Kahane (1997: 9).

Shawcross' words: "a distinction should be made between the physical means by which a piece of literature is composed [= medium] and the type of discourse employed in that composition [= conception]" (Shawcross 2005: 312).

More precisely, it is appropriate to conceive the notion of medium as a *dichotomy* (either phonic or graphic), while in the conceptual sense "oral" should be considered a *gradient* property: from more spoken to less spoken, with intermediate grades – or from "intimate" to "distant" when adopting Oesterreicher's terminology (a scale from "Sprache der Nähe" to "Sprache der Distanz"). As such, "texts may be oral to a greater or lesser degree, depending on the nature of the conception underlying them" (Bakker 1997a: 9; cf. also 1999: 30). In their monograph on historical pragmatics, Taavitsainen & Jucker (2010: 9f.) confirm the importance of this "reconstruction of the dichotomy of spoken versus written into a dichotomy based on medial realisation [= medium] and a scale of communicative distance [= conception]" for the study of so-called dead languages.

However, the two notions are often interrelated: a conceptionally oral text "is often medially oral as well, but it is also possible for such a discourse to be written" (Bakker 1997a: 8). Indeed, the two do not need to go together. Today, this is especially made clear by modern communication means; we can think, for instance, of chat language (written medium vs. oral conception), as Taavitsainen & Jucker (2010: 10) do: "But other graphically realised texts, such as email messages, Internet chat or short text messages may display many more signs of communicative immediacy". In this context, Anis (1998) has called electronic discourse a "written oral language". By now it should have become clear that "written" here refers to the medium, while "oral" pertains to the conception.

In fact, the same can be said of the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry: there is a discrepancy between the medium of these texts, which is written, and the conception underlying them, which is oral.

#### **1.1.2.5.1.1 Cf. oral performance?**

However, although the poets *originally* made use of the written medium, this does not exclude the possibility that, *later on*, they (or someone else) realised their writings "phonically", in which case the medium too thus became "oral". This actually pertains to the question whether the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry has been orally performed, as

was the case for many other medieval European vernacular literatures.<sup>41</sup> In general, it is assumed that before the invention of printing “oral delivery is still the rule rather than the exception” (Shawcross 2005: 331f.).<sup>42</sup>

With regard to the LMG tradition, Eideneier (1987) in particular has argued in favour of oral performance (cf. supra 1.1.2.2.2). Eideneier especially finds support in the manuscripts: according to him, many variants are of a phonetic nature and thus only make sense when read aloud. Therefore, he concludes that each manuscript is a separate recording of a (slightly) different performance of the same oral material:

“die Existenz verschiedener Bearbeitungen bzw. Versionen byzantinischer und postbyzantinischer Dichtungen mit der zur schriftlichen Tradierung parallel verlaufenden mündlichen Überlieferung haben (...) Mit ‘oral poetry’ hat dies alles nichts zu tun, sehr wohl aber mit ‘oral tradition’, bzw. ‘oral reception’” (Eideneier 1998: 245; cf. Smith 1987)

Moreover, the fact that an oral tradition has persisted in Greece until the 19<sup>th</sup> century (in the form of πολιτικὸς στίχος folk songs) seems an argument in favour of oral performance. Conca (1986: 36) too adheres to the thesis that the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry is orally performed: “non è inverosimile supporre che i romanzi della ‘Palaiologenzzeit’ fossero destinati ad una performance”. Nonetheless, this hypothesis has been explicitly rejected by Agapitos (2004: 35; fn 46), as “a hypothesis that cannot be supported by the palaeographical and codicological evidence provided by the manuscripts”. M. Jeffreys (1975a: 180) tends to exclude the possibility of oral performance: “Whether any of the surviving poems is a record of an oral performance remains unknown. Most, certainly, are not”.

The most realistic answer is perhaps that a *general* answer is not possible: the possibility of oral performance should perhaps best be investigated from text to text – or even from version to version, as Agapitos (2004: 43) suggests. As regards the *Achilleis Byzantina* (cf. infra 3.3), for instance, Agapitos (2006b: 162) suspects the Bodleian manuscript (Oxon. Bodl. Auct. T.5.24) to be the record of a real oral performance, while this is not the case for the other two manuscripts (Naples & Brit. Mus. addit. 8241) (cf. Smith 1987: 321ff.). However, since we lack external testimonies which describe a tradition of oral performances in Byzantium, we can hardly draw firm conclusions (cf. E. & M. Jeffreys 1986: 506ff.):

---

<sup>41</sup> Think, for instance, of the famous Provence tradition of troubadours (cf. Vitz, Regalado & Lawrence 2005).

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Ong (1984: 1); Zumthor (1987: 42f. & 115-121); Eideneier (1999: 106ff.).

“It is difficult to decide whether this fictitious audience setting was intended to function within a performative situation of actual recitation, (...), or if the audience setting here already reflects a literary convention” (Agapitos 2004: 43)

The fact that we cannot conclude with certainty whether (or which) LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poems have been subject to an oral performance does not at all invalidate the above outlined oral-formulaic style hypothesis. Once again, the term “oral” in “oral-formulaic style” hypothesis clearly refers to the conception and not to the medium of the texts. As a matter of fact, when conducting linguistic research, the conception of a text is of much more relevance than the medium. The (eventual) physical realisation of a text does not make much difference to its language: whether a text is heard (spoken medium) or read (written medium), its underlying linguistic conception does not alter. Thus, for my purpose, the issue of oral performance is not strictly relevant.

#### 1.1.2.5.2 Stylistic issue

In this context, a small warning is in order. The view that the linguistic conception of the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry is oral has mainly been derived from the presence of formulas, as the following two quotations by E. Jeffreys most clearly testify (cf. *passim supra*):

“the stylistic features of that oral poetry left their mark in subsequent purely written poetic conventions – most conspicuously in the repeated phrases which the Jeffreys have emphasised” (E. Jeffreys 2013: 230)

“The most convincing evidence that this group of fourteenth-century texts has been produced against a background in oral poetry takes the form of a high ‘formula’ count in certain of them” (E. Jeffreys 2011: 470)

Indeed, the oral-formulaic style hypothesis has almost exclusively been based on one phenomenon, i.e. the formula, which is “the basic ingredient of this style” (Bakker 1999: 36). The presence of formulas sometimes seems sufficient to judge upon the oral-formulaic style adopted by a text. Papathomopoulos & E. Jeffreys (1996: lxxxvi), for instance, observe: “one may conclude from examination of the formulas in the *War of Troy* that its poet was writing under the influence of an oral poetic tradition”. Thus, especially the phenomenon of formulas has been studied in the light of the oral-formulaic style hypothesis.

This actually points to a second complication of the term “oral” as used by Byzantinists: it cannot be straightforwardly equated with “spoken”, as in our daily use of the term. Rather, it should get a more restrictive interpretation, for it mainly refers

to a *stylistic* (i.e. formulaic) issue. Therefore, “oral” is here to be distinguished from “spoken”. The above mentioned formula μικροί τε καὶ μεγάλοι, for instance, testifies to this: the particle τε no longer belonged to the spoken language of the time, so this formula is made up of contemporary as well as ancient items and thus attests to the so-called mixed language of the πολιτικός στίχος poetry.

To summarise this section on the status of the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry, I repeat its two most important hallmarks: 1) it is reputed to be the eye-witness of LMG vernacular, yet actually incorporates a number of ancient elements as well; 2) it has adopted an oral-formulaic style. Thus, at the very least, we can conclude that its language is not easily grasped. Needless to say that this has complicated linguistic studies. Nevertheless, I have found an interesting line of research which I consider ideal to deal with the poetry’s peculiar features. This parallel research will be treated in the next section of my introduction.

## 1.2 Quaestio

### 1.2.1 Parallel research

#### 1.2.1.1 The link between orally conceived poetry and naturally spoken language

The line of research which I find inspiring for a linguistic approach of the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry *as a whole* departs from the observation that there are more parallels between orally conceived poetry and naturally spoken language than usually thought. Although I have just warned that the term “oral” in the “oral-formulaic style hypothesis” refers to a stylistic issue, c.q. formulas, and cannot be considered entirely synonymous with “spoken”, I do believe that orally conceived poetry, like the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry, and naturally spoken language have a lot in common:

“When we present a spoken discourse, with its oral conception, as text, we tend to think of that text as ‘primitive’ or, in another context, as ‘archaic’, without realising that when we talk ourselves, our own discourse, when transcribed and presented in written form, may look very similar” (Bakker 1999: 33)

In comparison to language with a *written* conception, the information is presented less densely and imparted in smaller chunks in naturally spoken language. The reason for this different organisation is evident: readers can read a text at their own speed and are



even able to reread passages, while in spoken discourse information has to be processed at once. Thus, the cognitive principles of producing and processing language are similar for orally conceived poetry on the one hand and naturally spoken language on the other.

The validity of the comparison between orally conceived poetry and naturally spoken language has already been recognised with regard to other medieval European vernacular literatures that have preserved “oral echoes” (cf. supra 1.1.2.4.2):

“A number of recent studies have argued that the primarily oral discourse of medieval texts shares some of the pragmatic features of *contemporary oral discourse* and that the tools of discourse analysis provide a fuller explication of the functions of these oral features than has been provided by traditional explanations” (Brinton 1996: 5f.; my italics)

“Many of the linguistic ‘peculiarities’ of the medieval texts which we now read with an unavoidable belles-lettristic bias have analogues in *the ‘natural’ narratives of everyday interaction* (...) What remains is to convince medievalists concerned with the linguistic problems posed by their texts of the relevance to their research of the discourse work currently being done on natural narrative” (Fleishman 1985: 873f.; my italics)

As Brinton and Fleishman both warn, linguists with a rather traditional (i.e. written biased) perspective are often unable to deal with the singularities of orally conceived texts: these are considered peculiar or even blatantly wrong. However, these “peculiarities” would become understandable when adopting a theoretical framework that recognises the resemblances between orally conceived poetry and naturally spoken language. The theoretical framework which I consider ideal for this aim is the modern linguistic theory of Information Structure (IS), which has been founded on the basis of contemporary spoken (!) languages and attaches great importance to pragmatics. So, my analysis of the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry will be couched in IS (cf. infra chapter 2).

### 1.2.1.2 Homeric speech

However, I must confess that I am not the first one applying concepts from this framework developed on the basis of spoken living languages to so-called dead languages. As a matter of fact, a recent line of linguistic research on the Homeric poetry has adopted an IS perspective, resulting in a number of illuminating studies (Slings 1992;

Bakker 1990a&b & 1997a&b; Janse 1998a; 2003 & 2012; Allan 2009).<sup>43</sup> These have led to groundbreaking insights into Homeric language: they have altered the status of key features, such as metre, formulas and enjambments, and made us rethink our conception of Homeric discourse. In other words: they contributed to a much more natural conception of Homeric language. Katz (2003: 621), for instance, refers to the pioneering character of these linguistic studies:

“Some of the most interesting recent work in Indo-European studies looks at not just “normal” language, which is the usual object of most linguistic research, but also forms of speech, like poetry, that are delivered in an exceptional context”

He explicitly mentions the research on the Homeric poetry as an example.

The importance of Bakker can hardly be overestimated in this context. Indeed, it is Bakker who has most extensively elaborated the idea of a parallel between the Homeric language and the naturally spoken language. He explicitly relates Homeric poetry to naturally spoken language, as the title of his book “Poetry in Speech (Orality and Homeric Discourse)” betrays (Bakker 1997a). Basically, he approaches phenomena which were considered purely “metrical” from a cognitive-linguistic perspective, namely from an IS perspective. In Bakker’s (1997: 304b) view, even formulas essentially reflect natural speech: “Formulas derive from the very nature of spoken language, as a regularization of its basic segment, the cognitively determined intonation unit” (cf. for more on the intonation unit, see *infra* 2.3). This is confirmed by recent research on modern spoken languages: we might be surprised to know how much of our everyday language consists of “formulaic patterns” (Wray & Perkins 2000).<sup>44</sup>

### 1.2.1.3 *Stylised speech*

Of course, both types of discourse, i.e. orally conceived poetry and naturally spoken language, cannot simply be equated with each other, as Bakker (1999: 37f.) immediately alerts: “Such an analysis does not aim at a simple equation of Homeric discourse and *ordinary* speech. On the contrary, Homer is highly stylised, artful speech, rhythmically

---

<sup>43</sup> Before continuing, I want to make clear that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are not the only Ancient Greek texts which have already been subject to successful pragmatic studies couched in IS. I will refer to other IS-related studies on Ancient Greek in chapter 5, which contains my actual analysis of the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry; cf. *infra* 5.2.1.1 & 5.3.1.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Wray (2002); Schmitt (2004).

very sophisticated”. Hence, Bakker (1997b: 300) labels the Homeric language “special speech” or *stylised* speech. Beaton (1980: 43) shows the same awareness:

“formulas in Greek songs are not fixed and memorised units but may be derived (...) from a system, or a series of systems, of *stylised* language and syntax (...) from the underlying system, which can be more generally defined as *a stylisation* of language according to fixed patterns” (Beaton 1980: 43; my italics)

In the same vein, Brinton (1996: 8) talks about pragmatic or discourse markers in Old English orally conceived narratives (for more on pragmatic/discourse markers, see *infra* 2.5):

“I investigate whether medieval narrative might be structured much like contemporary oral narrative and whether these linguistic features might be functionally motivated in ways analogous to pragmatic markers in Modern English discourse (...) However, I recognise that the function of oral features in the written texts of Old and Middle English may be somewhat different from the function of comparable features in the strictly oral discourse of Modern English, perhaps being used self-consciously as *stylised* pragmatic markers” (Brinton 1996: 8; my italics)

We have seen that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* show some similarities with the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry: beside being composed in a metre, the Homeric language too abounds with formulas and also contains a mixture of linguistic elements. This initially led to an equation of the two traditions (cf. *supra* 1.1.2.3.1). Nowadays, however, it is firmly established that the genesis of the Homeric epics and that of the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry is fundamentally different: the epics testify to primary orality, whereas the πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry is the conscious product of literate poets and bears the reflections of secondary orality (cf. *supra* 1.1.2.4.1). Nonetheless, what matters is that both types of poetry are *orally conceived* (the Homeric epics being medially oral as well). Hence, it is justified to consider this IS-based research on the Homeric language a useful parallel and a source of inspiration for my purpose, which I will now elucidate.

## 1.2.2 My modern linguistic approach

### 1.2.2.1 The πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry *as a whole*

As announced in the preface, it is my purpose to conduct research that goes beyond focusing on one specific grammatical issue; it is my purpose to offer a theoretical framework in which the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry can be approached and

understood as a whole and which can thus perfectly deal with its peculiar hallmarks. As just mentioned, this led me to the adoption of a theoretical framework developed on the basis of modern spoken languages, i.e. IS. Such a linguistic analysis of the texts from a modern pragmatic perspective is totally innovative with regard to the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry:

“The use of the pragmatic approach in the 1990s, which surpassed the boundaries of a grammatical sentence, then made a deeper analysis of a sentence or a discourse structure possible. However, the Byzantine period remained aside of this increased interest” (Loudová 2008: 1)

As such, my analysis will be well embedded in current linguistic theory and will constitute the first attempt to develop a modern linguistic approach towards the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry as a whole.

#### 1.2.2.2 Foretaste

It is my purpose to demonstrate that this pragmatic approach towards the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry will lead to a better understanding of its language, metre and discourse. To give a foretaste:

- (1) πῶς ἔπαθεν ἐκ τὰς ἀρχὰς ἐκείνη καὶ ὁ Ἰμπερης. (IM 848)  
“how [she] suffered from the beginning, she and Imberios”

In more traditional linguistic approaches, which usually have a written bias, the lack of grammatical agreement between the verb (ἔπαθεν; singular) and its subject (ἐκείνη καὶ ὁ Ἰμπερης; plural) risks being called “awkward” (e.g. Papathomopoulos & E. Jeffreys 1996: lxxvi).

Something similar holds for the next example, in which there is no agreement in number between the object clitic pronoun τόν (singular) and its referent ἐκεῖνον καὶ τὴν κόρην (plural):

- (2) καὶ ἀτοί τοὺς τόν ἐνδύσασιν ἐκεῖνον καὶ τὴν κόρην (AB 1502)  
“and they got him dressed, him and the girl”

In the next example, the object clitic pronoun την risks being considered redundant, for τὴν γραφὴν constitutes the actual direct object:

- (3) Ἐπέτασά την τὴν γραφὴν, ἐπῆρα, ἐφίλησά την (LR 1747)  
“I took it, the letter, I held (it), I kissed it”

In the following verse, ὁ ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Ὡλενας might simply seem a pending constituent, unconnected to the rest of the utterance:

- (4) ὁ ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Ὡλενας τέσσαρα φῖε τοῦ ἔδωκαν (CoM H 1957)  
Lurier (1964: 128): “the bishop of Olena was given four fees”

Lurier seems to have some difficulties to cope with this verse, for he ignores the object clitic pronoun τοῦ in his translation.

In the next example, it does not make much sense to translate the adverb πάλιν in its traditional way (“again” or “back”):

- (5) Ἐγὼ πατήρ σου εὐρίσκομαι, ἐσὺ δὲ πάλιν υἱός μου (BT 11309)  
“I am your father, you (are) my son”

The same applies to the following example: although Lurier renders σὲ λαλῶ by “I tell you”, this translation is not very revealing in the context, which is purely narrative. The literal translation “I tell you” does not reflect the phrase’s actual function, namely signalling a clarification, appropriately:

- (6) ποῦ ἐλάλησαν καὶ εἶπασιν ὅτι ἦλθαν τὰ φουσσᾶτα  
Lurier (1964: 99): “who talked and said that the armies were coming”  
τοῦ Καλοϊωάννη, σὲ λαλῶ, ἐκείνου τοῦ δεσπότη. (CoM H 1101-1102)  
“(the armies) of Kalojohn, I tell you, that despot”

I will show that these examples all become perfectly understandable within the framework of IS and will come back to them in my conclusion (cf. *infra* 6.2). More precisely, three concepts within IS will offer an answer: 1) the intonation/information unit; 2) the topic/focus pair and 3) the phenomenon of discourse markers. These three concepts will function as leitmotifs throughout my dissertation and will be outlined in the next chapter (chapter 2), in which I will introduce the theory of IS.

### 1.2.2.3 Structure

The remainder of this dissertation is structured as follows: chapter 3 will deal with my corpus. Among the different genres in which the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry has been preserved (3.1), the romance is by far the most representative one. After giving some general information on the genre of the romance (3.2), I will discuss the particular texts (beside 7 lengthy romances also one chronicle) that I have included in my corpus and motivate why I have chosen these particular stories as well as the particular versions and editions (3.3).

Before proceeding to my actual analysis in the chapter 5, I will go more deeply into the metre central to this dissertation in chapter 4: the πολιτικὸς στίχος. More

concretely, I will show that this metre is a very natural and flexible one. For this purpose, I will first demonstrate the naturalness of its rhythm, mainly by relying on previous research (4.1). Afterwards, I will present the results of two extensive case studies of my own; both studies testify to the flexibility of the metre under scrutiny (4.2). As such, I would like to revalue the prejudice apparently shared by a number of scholars that the πολιτικός στίχος poetry is unsuitable for any kind of linguistic research, because its metre imposes a straitjacket on the language.

In chapter 5 I will apply the framework of IS to the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry. For the sake of clarity, this part parallels the structure of the theoretical chapter and is thus divided into three large parts: 5.1: intonation/information unit; 5.2: topic/focus; 5.3: discourse markers. Since this part is as a whole dedicated to my own research, it constitutes the core of my dissertation.

As usual, in the last part (chapter 6) my conclusions are formulated and suggestions for further research are given.

## Chapter 2    The theory of Information Structure

My analysis of the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry will be couched in the modern linguistic theory of Information Structure (IS), which has been developed on the basis of contemporary spoken languages. Admittedly, this label does not cover a single well-defined theory, but combines a number of studies which share the same assumptions about language and how it should be studied. I will concentrate on three crucial concepts within IS: the intonation/information unit (2.3), the topic/focus pair (2.4) and discourse markers (2.5). I will justify this eclectic approach in 2.2. First, however, I will briefly situate this framework in the field of linguistics (2.1).

### 2.1 General information

The theory of IS belongs to the modern – so-called “functional” or “cognitive”-approaches which radically break with a tradition in which linguists relied mostly or even exclusively on written and introspective data. Artificially constructed and thus “self-contained” sentences such as “John hits the ball”, which are hardly heard in everyday speech, are abandoned in favour of spontaneous spoken data, to be studied in their natural context rather than in a vacuum (cf. Tao 1996). Consequently, pragmatics plays a central part in these approaches. Katz (2003: 261) fittingly describes this new Zeitgeist:

“What is important to understand is that every linguist is an oralist:<sup>1</sup> language exists in the first place for the purpose of communication, and the most basic form of this communication is through a medium other than writing, which for everything other than sign language is via the mouth”

Indeed, in IS utmost importance is attached to natural speech, as its synonyms “grammar of speech” and “grammar of spoken language” indicate (Edwards 2002: 9).

More concretely – and as its name reveals –, the core program of IS centres around the “structuring of information” or “information packaging” (Chafe 1976). Observing that information is not always conveyed in nicely demarcated sentences/clauses in natural speech, a preliminary hurdle which linguists working within the IS paradigm had to clear was finding a new basic unit for the analysis of language: “An initial problem for any discourse-oriented linguist is the one of dividing the flow of speech into useful units for analysis” (Tao 1996: 9). The purely syntactic notion of sentence/clause, being a structuralist and in se written construct, was indeed not always appropriate when working with natural spoken data, speech being differently organised than purely written language. This has resulted in the development of the intonation/information unit (IU), which is now the standard unit of analysis in most IS-based studies (2.3).

Basically, the question about the structuring of information amounts to the question about the “status” of information. In this regard, an important notion is the since long known – though still often misinterpreted – topic/focus distinction (2.4).

A third concept which plays a crucial role in structuring information is the phenomenon of discourse markers (DMs), which have especially in recent years received much attention (2.5). It is these three concepts that will function as leitmotifs through my dissertation.

## 2.2 My eclectic approach: “back to basics”

Before giving a detailed theoretical account of these three key notions (IU, topic/focus, DMs), I should warn that only a small part of the field of IS will be covered here. The reason for this eclectic approach is twofold.

---

<sup>1</sup> Self-evidently, the term “oral” is used here in its daily sense, i.e. as a synonym of “spoken”; cf. supra 1.1.2.5.2.



### 2.2.1 Obligatorily eclectic

First, it is simply impossible to give an exhaustive overview of all aspects treated in IS studies. The secondary literature is overwhelming, for IS has known a proliferation of terms and notions. According to Hedberg (2006: 105), the study of IS has sometimes been called a “terminological minefield”. Unfortunately, this terminological discord also reflects confusion concerning (the precise definition of) concepts. Especially during the last decade, the field of IS has become enormously complicated: linguists have added several subclassifications (in particular concerning different subtypes of topic and focus; cf. *infra* 2.4.3). They have also been introducing nuances which are so fine-grained that they sometimes seem to have only a theoretical status instead of having any practical value. Furthermore, as there is already disagreement on the basic notions, on these further subtleties unanimity is even more far to seek.

It is thus crucial to give clear elementary definitions. For this purpose, I return to the basics. By this, I mean that I will especially rely on pioneering studies, as these often contain the most straightforward definitions. As such, I will take the investigations by Wallace Chafe as my starting point (Chafe 1976; 1980; 1987; 1988; 1993; 1994; 1996; 1998 & 2001). It is this American linguist who has coined the term “information packaging” and who has developed the concept of the intonation/information unit. Far from being “outdated”, his research and its impact can hardly be overestimated. Krifka (2006: 2) is just one of the many contemporary linguists who admit that Chafe’s work is still pivotal in modern linguistics:

“In his seminal paper on notions of IS of 1976, Chafe introduced the notion of packaging of the information conveyed in an utterance that, to my mind, still provides useful guidance for our understanding of IS”

### 2.2.2 Deliberately eclectic

However, I am also deliberately eclectic. Adhering to the principle that theory should serve a practical purpose – theory should put the data in a new light –, I consider it unnecessary to dwell upon matters which will be of no use in the remainder of this dissertation. Thus, it might be clear that my primary interest lies in the (linguistically underexplored) Greek data, not in the development and/or fine-tuning of “the theoretical machinery of pragmatics”, as Goldstein (2008) calls it. To give an example: it is not my aim to come up with the ultimate definition of what constitutes the class of DMs; I just want to show that LMG possesses several expressions which would in modern spoken languages be identified as DMs (cf. *infra* 5.3). Given that this is the first

attempt to develop a modern linguistic approach towards the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry, I consider this policy justified.

At the same time, I hope that this “broader” approach will make my work accessible to a larger audience: since this dissertation does not address a readership of specialist-linguists only, it might also be of interest to classicists, philologists and even literary theorists and medievalists.

As a result, I will only give a theoretical account of the three concepts which can be said to function as leitmotifs throughout my dissertation: the concept of the IU (2.3), the topic/focus pair (2.4) and the phenomenon of DMs (2.5).

## 2.3 Intonation/Information unit

The IU has been developed as a new unit for the analysis of (spoken) language, in order to emphasise the fact that we do not speak in complex grammatical sentences or clauses, but in short chunks of speech which reflect the consciousness of the speaker.

No uniform terminology is used to designate these speech chunks or “spurts of vocalization” (Chafe 1987: 1). Common terms are: “sentence segment” (Janse 1991); “intonation groups” (Cruttenden 1997<sup>2</sup>); “intonation(al) phrases” (Selkirk 1984; Nespor & Vogel 1986); “tone units” (Crystal 1975; Brazil 1997<sup>2</sup>); “tone groups” (Halliday 1985).<sup>2</sup> Chafe, who has been the principal designer of this concept in a series of articles (1987; 1988; 1993; 1998 & 2001), first employs the term “idea unit”, but converts himself to “intonation unit”, which is nowadays the term that is “most strongly associated with the research tradition that analyzes naturally occurring discourse rather than made up data in literature” (Iwasaki 1996: 750).<sup>3</sup> However, Slings (1999: 62) convincingly argues to use the term “information unit” when dealing with so-called dead languages. By using the well-known abbreviation “IU”, we leave the choice between either “intonation unit” or “information unit” (or “idea unit”) open.

---

<sup>2</sup> The term “turn constructional unit/phrase” is excluded from this list, since it is especially used by Conversation Analysts who employ the concept from an interactional perspective (Selting 1996 & 2000; Szczepek Reed 2010).

<sup>3</sup> It should be admitted that in a pre-Chafean area Fraenkel has conducted ground-breaking research on an equal concept in a series of articles entitled “Kolon und Satz” (1932; 1933 & 1965) within the scope of ancient colometry (cf. Scheppers 2011).

On the other hand, on the definition of the term, scholars are surprisingly unanimous: an IU has been conceived as a prosodic (2.3.1), a semantic (2.3.2) and a syntactic unit (2.3.3). It has also been established that IUs tend to be linked to each other paratactically (2.3.4).

### 2.3.1 Prosodic unit

As is reflected by the term “intonation unit”, the IU has primarily been defined from a prosodic perspective: it is “a stretch of speech occurring under a single unified intonation contour” (Chafe 1987: 22). Thus, a number of prosodic criteria are used to demarcate IUs from each other: final lengthening; anacrusis; pitch resetting/change. The criterion which is most often mentioned to identify an IU boundary is the breathing pause (Cruttenden 1997<sup>2</sup>: 30). To be perfectly clear, however, the occurrence of a breathing pause is nor a necessary nor a sufficient criterion to assume an IU boundary. It can be the case that only one of these prosodic criteria is fulfilled at the time. Moreover, no hierarchy of importance has been established so far (cf. Allwood 1996).

### 2.3.2 Semantic unit

Semantically, an IU usually expresses one idea and thus also constitutes a sense-unit. This is the reason why Chafe speaks of “idea units” in his early work. However, realising this is a rather vague, pretheoretical notion, he abandoned the term. Nevertheless, Chafe’s original conception of the IU was based on *cognitive* grounds: the short speech units reflect the limited amount of (new) ideas on which our mind can consciously focus, under the principle that “speech is inseparable from our consciousness” (Ong 1982: 9). According to Chafe, only one new idea can appear per IU.

Chafe (1982) has related this observation to the different organisation of spoken language as compared to *written* language. A speaker organises his information less densely: the information is presented in smaller chunks. Spoken language is thus more aimed at chunking, that is to say, in “strategies that administer new information in small doses” (Slings 1992: 108). This “fragmented” nature of spoken language is a natural consequence of the fact that speaking is a much faster process than writing. Chunking is indeed more necessary in spoken than in written discourse because readers can read a text at their own speed and are even able to reread passages, while in spoken discourse information has to be processed at once (cf. Slings 1997). However, as this last sentence might give the impression that the “speed of speech” primarily effects the listener or the level of *processing*, it should be emphasised that it also concerns the

speaker or the level of *producing*. As such, many spoken phenomena can be explained as facilitating “encoding and decoding in progress” (Halford 1996: 136). Slings (2002: 53) gives a nice summary:

“The primary difference between speech and text, oral and written language, is the organization of its units. In text, there is a central syntactic unit, the main clause: the writer is at liberty to add subsidiary information in various types of embedded clauses, which are organised around the central unit. By contrast, speech has as its basic unit the *chunk*, a unit which in spoken language is recognizable by its intonation pattern, and which is therefore often called intonation unit. These intonation units are information units at the same time”

### 2.3.3 Syntactic unit

As mentioned above, one of the most important consequences of Chafe’s findings is that the traditional notion of sentence/clause has lost its key role (cf. Bakker 1990a: 3; Bakker 2010: 152). Indeed, spoken discourse seems to have its own syntax, as Bakker (1990a: 4) calls it: “The typically fragmented organization of ongoing speech in idea units has its own syntax, which differs considerably from formal educated written language”.

In traditional grammars with a written bias, this “spoken syntax” was often neglected and if not, its structures were considered deviant or even blatantly wrong, although these are not perceived as such by the speaker/listener:<sup>4</sup>

“A person who writes is able to order his thoughts in all tranquility and put them together; a person who speaks has to present them in chunks that are comfortable to process, and in doing so has to accept irregularities which maybe he does not even feel are there” (Slings 2002: 59)

Nonetheless, despite the loss of importance of traditional grammar, including its standard notion of sentence/clause, the identification of syntactic units is still important in IS, for IUs tend to coincide with syntactic units (but do not need to!), such as a clause or a phrase: “These bursts often consist of a single grammatical phrase or clause” (Johnstone 2008<sup>2</sup>: 68).<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Ong (1982: 37): “Oral structures often look to pragmatics (...) Chirographic structures look more to syntactics”.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Johnstone (2008<sup>2</sup>: 71); Scheppers (2011: 21 & 28).

Much research has been done on the relationship between IU and syntactic unit, especially in English. Croft (1995), for instance, calculated that 97% of the English IUs in his corpus are syntactic units (cf. Cruttenden 1997<sup>2</sup>). Especially clauses appear as prototypical IUs in English, which had already been noted by Chafe (1980: 14)<sup>6</sup>. Brown & Yule (1983: 159), on the other hand, think that the phrase is a much more likely candidate. In the last decade a variety of other languages have been taken into account as well; including Japanese (Clancy, Suzuki, Tao & Thompson 1996; Iwasaki 1993; Matsumoto 2000 & 2003), Chinese Mandarin (Tao 1996); Taiwanese Mandarin (Tseng 2006 & 2008), Thai (Iwasaki 1996); Finnish (Helasvuo 2001), Hebrew (Amir, Silber-Varod & Izre'el 2004; Izre'el 2005); Korean (Kim 1999) and Sasak (Wouk 2008).<sup>7</sup>

As announced, even the “dead” language of the Homeric epics has been subject to an analysis in IUs (cf. supra 1.2.1.2). More concretely, the IU has been applied to the dactylic hexameter, the metre of the epics. The dactylic hexameter is divided into two or more parts by the so-called caesura. Traditionally, these parts, labelled “cola”, were considered purely metrical phenomena, having little to do with natural, spoken discourse. Fraenkel (1932, 1933 & 1965), who has done pioneering work, as well as Janse (1998a; 2003 & 2012), has shown that caesurae actually imply potential breathing pauses and that cola thus coincide with the chunks of spoken discourse identified by modern linguists. Bakker (1990a: 5) also argues for the abandonment of the concept of “sentence” in favour of the IU: “The application to the Homeric style of the concept of the fragmentation of oral narrative into idea units has, I think, an immediate appeal”. Of course, Bakker realises that an IU in ordinary speech does not constitute the perfect equivalent of an IU in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*:

“The oral basis consists in abandoning, along the lines of Chafe, the concept of ‘sentence’ in favour of an approach in terms of ‘idea units’ reflecting the cognitive processes of the narrator (...) Of course, in Homer this process is a great deal more complicated, because of the exigencies posed by the verse, but I believe that the principle basically applies” (Bakker 1990a: 19)

Therefore, Bakker (1997a: 53) speaks of *stylised* IUs (cf. supra 1.2.1.3).

By showing that such short units, which reflect the flow of speech through the consciousness of the speaker, are present in Homeric poetry, these scholars have

---

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Chafe (1987: 38); Chafe (1988: 24).

<sup>7</sup> Like in English, the syntactic counterpart of the IU turns out to be the clause in most of the investigated languages (Park 2002: 634). In Korean and Japanese, though, the phrase seems also a popular candidate (Iwasaki & Tao 1993; Kim 1999).

offered a highly innovative approach to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in specific and orally conceived poetry in general. Furthermore, this application has had some important consequences for a number of other typical “metrical” phenomena, such as enjambment. Enjambment is traditionally defined as a complex extended *sentence* whose last part occupies more metrical space than just one verse. However, within an IS approach, enjambment becomes just another IU in a series of IUs and is thus interpreted as a cognitive phenomenon (instead of as a purely metrical one). Bakker (1990a: 2) even says that it is preferable to suppress the term “enjambment” altogether. I give one passage from the *Iliad*, in which the succession of short chunks of information (demarcated by |) is very clear:

Ἑκτωρ δ' ἐξ ὀχέων | σὺν τεύχεσιν ἄλτο χαμᾶζε,  
 “and Hektor leapt in his armour from his chariot to the ground”  
 πάλλων δ' ὀξέα δοῦρα | κατὰ στρατὸν ὥχετο πάντη  
 “and brandishing his two sharp spears went everywhere throughout the host,”  
 ὀτρύνων μαχέσασθαι, | ἔγειρε δὲ φύλοπιν αἰνήν.  
 “urging them to fight, and roused the dread din of battle.”  
 οἳ δ' ἐλελίχθησαν | καὶ ἐναντίοι ἔσταν Ἀχαιῶν,  
 “So they rallied, and took their stand with their faces toward the Achaeans,”  
 Ἀργεῖοι δ' ἐτέρωθεν | ἐκαρτύναντο φάλαγγας.  
 “and the Argives over against them made strong their battalions.”  
 ἀρτύνθη δὲ μάχη, | στὰν δ' ἀντίοι | ἐν δ' Ἀγαμέμνων  
 “And the battle was set in array, and they stood over against each other, and among them Agamemnon”  
 πρῶτος ὄρουσ', | ἔθελεν δὲ πολὺ | προμάχεσθαι ἀπάντων (Il. 11.211-217; cf. Bakker 1990a: 6)  
 “rushed forth the first, and was minded to fight far in advance of all”

Almost all these IUs are linked by the particle δέ, which clearly functions as a simple connector between successive IUs. As such, Bakker describes the function of δέ in terms of continuation: “As a maximally neutral linking device, δέ in Homer simply marks the progression of one idea to another” (Bakker 1990a: 6; cf. Denniston 1954<sup>2</sup>: 162). This has been labelled the “adding” or “cumulative” style of Homer (Bakker 1990a: 2; cf. Kirk 1985). We get a linear succession of chunks, which are joined in a rather simple way. This observation constitutes the perfect transition to the next subsection.

### 2.3.4 Parataxis

Indeed, the linkage between successive IUs in speech happens in a linear way: every new chunk is simply added to the previous one (Slings 1999: 73). Spoken language thus proceeds from chunk to chunk: every IU is on the same level as the previous one, so that hierarchical relations between subsequent IUs are relatively limited. Hence, we metaphorically speak of spoken discourse as a “stream” of words or a “flow” of information.

Actually, this linear information flow often comes down to a so-called paratactically organised discourse: IUs are placed side by side, either without explicit conjunctions or with rather simple ones, such as the coordinator “and”. Again, this fact has been firmly established with regard to English: Chafe (1988: 10) observes that in English fully 50% of the cases with explicit connectives include the “maximally general connective *and*”. Brown-Yule (1983: 6) also add *but*, *then* and – more rarely – *if*. To come back to the above Iliadic example: Homeric  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  seems thus comparable to English “and”.

Parataxis has in general been acknowledged to be a universal feature of speech: “One of the most widely recognized features of oral narrative, artistic or conversational, is its paratactic organization” (Fleischman 1985: 862; cf. Fludernik 1991: 377). Ong (1982: 36f.), one of the most famous theoreticians of orality, has also listed the preference for additive rather than subordinative structures among the characteristics which distinguish spoken from written discourse (cf. Givón 1979: 229). Finally, Hofmann (1951<sup>3</sup>: 105) even calls the dislike for “Unterordnung durch Nebensätze jeder Art” the most conspicuous hallmark of spoken language in comparison to written one.

In conclusion, the prototypical IU is demarcated by a breathing pause, constitutes a sense unit and corresponds to a syntactic unit. Moreover, it stands in a simple paratactic relation to the surrounding IUs. Although all these prosodic, semantic and syntactic criteria have a non-categorical character (cf. Allwood 1996), the IU is considered a “well established unit of spoken discourse” (Tao 1996: 11).

## 2.4 Topic/focus pair

A second concept that has truly dominated IS-based research and that will also play a major role in my dissertation is the topic/focus pair, which we can – in rather vague terms – introduce as a notion having to do with the “status” of information. To begin with, this notion also departs from the assumption that traditional grammar – and in

particular syntax – is in itself insufficient to explain the structuring of information. Accordingly, the topic/focus pair cannot be defined directly on syntactic structures (Reinhart 1981: 56).<sup>8</sup>

Especially regarding the notion of topic(ality) there is extremely much confusion: “the inherently vague and wide varying definition of topic is problematic” (Jaeger & Gerassimova 2002: 205). Indeed, it has been mixed up with the concept of referential givenness (2.4.1), as well as with the notion of discourse topic (2.4.2).

### 2.4.1 Vs. referential givenness

Strictly speaking, topic is the counterpart of the concept “focus”. The topic/focus distinction captures the essence of the pair theme/rheme introduced by the Prague school (Guentchéva 2008: 211). Unfortunately, the concept “topic” has often been equated with “old”, “given” or “known” information (and “focus” thus with “new” information). It is not difficult at all to find statements testifying to this mistaken usage; let me give just one example:

“the new information that is emphasised, is called the focus. Conversely, any noun phrase that is already known and agreed on by the speakers is called the topic”  
(Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warbuton 2004: 230)

Briefly, the focus of an utterance indeed consists of emphasised information, yet this information is not necessarily new, while the topic indeed constitutes information “agreed on by the speakers” (to talk about), but it does not always have to be “already known”.

Recently, Gundel & Fretheim (2004), building on ideas of Reinhart (1981), have clearly pointed out this double use of the term “topic” (and to a lesser extent of the term “focus”). They distinguish two types of “givenness/newness”: *referential* givenness/newness and *relational* givenness/newness. The proper use of the term “topic” must be sought at the latter level, as the term “can only apply to linguistic expressions” and “involves a partition of the semantic/conceptual representation of a sentence into two complementary parts, X and Y, where X is what the sentence is about

---

<sup>8</sup> Nonetheless, there have been attempts – mainly within the generative framework – to map certain syntactic constituents automatically with either topical or focal status (cf. Gundel & Fretheim 2004: 176). There is, for instance, a strong preference to interpret the grammatical subject of the sentence as the typical syntactic equivalent of the topic (cf. Reinhart 1981: 62; Jansen 1981: 64).



[= topic] (...) and Y is what is predicated about X [= focus]” (Gundel & Fretheim 2004: 176f.).<sup>9</sup> Hence, some speak of a (pragmatic) “aboutness topic”.<sup>10</sup>

Referential givenness/newness, on the other hand, “involves a relation between a linguistic expression and a corresponding non-linguistic entity in the speaker/hearer’s mind, the discourse (model), or some real or possible world” (Gundel & Fretheim 2004: 176). Indeed, a referent can be referentially given, even if it has not been literally mentioned in the discourse, for the referential state of a certain referent can also be derived from the presence of other discourse elements, or even from the extralinguistic context. Lambrecht (1994: 100) calls these three types of accessibility respectively “textual”, “inferential” and “situational accessibility”.

It is important to realise that referential givenness/newness is gradual rather than binary. Brown & Yule (1983: 182), for instance, argue for a richer taxonomy than the simple “given/new” distinction”, since referents may be more or less new with respect to each other (cf. Geluykens 1992: 12). Examples of referential givenness/newness continua are Chafe’s (1994) “activation statuses”, Gundel, Hedberg & Zacharski’s (1993) “givenness hierarchy”, and Geluykens’ (1992) “recoverability scale”.

On the one extreme of the continuum, we find information which has just been mentioned (or which is immediately present in the extralinguistic context). This active information is typically expressed by pronouns (Ziv 1994: 634).<sup>11</sup> On the other hand, brand new, inactive information usually takes the form of indefinite expressions: “It has often been observed that, in English, new information is characteristically introduced by indefinite expressions and subsequently referred to by definite expressions” (Brown & Yule 1983: 169). Definite expressions might indeed also represent active information, although they usually occupy a position more to the inactive end of the scale than pronouns. Referents which have been previously mentioned but which do not appear in the immediately preceding discourse are somewhere in between and thus “semi-active”.

Since referential givenness/newness and relational givenness/newness are logically independent (Gundel & Fretheim 2004: 179), it is theoretically possible that a referentially old piece of information is presented as the relationally most prominent information and thus as the focus of the utterance (Féry, Fanselow & Krifka 2006: 7; cf. Féry 2006: 4), for instance:

---

<sup>9</sup> See also S. Dik’s (1997<sup>2</sup>) work, who is the father of Functional Grammar.

<sup>10</sup> E.g. Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl (2007); de Vries (2007).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Gundel, Hedberg & Zacharski (1993: 278); Estigarribia (2006: 133).

– Who called?

(Gundel & Fretheim 2004: 179)

– Pat said SHE called

The pronoun “she” is referentially given, yet constitutes the relationally most prominent information and consequently functions as the focus of the utterance. The opposite holds as well: referentially new information can constitute the topic (Féry 2006: 4). Thus, being active information is not a sufficient condition for topicality (Reinhart 1981: 73; Chanut 1988: 76).

Nevertheless, a correlation seems to exist between the two types of givenness/newness, since it is natural that referentially new information coincides with the relationally most prominent and thus the focalised information. On the other hand, we expect referentially given information to constitute the topic of an utterance. According to Hedberg & Fadden (2007: 49f.), topics indeed have to “attain a certain level of referential givenness (...) in order to function cognitively as ‘the peg on which the message is hung’”.<sup>12</sup> As such, pronouns and definite expressions have been considered prototypical topics (Slings 1992: 99).

Consequently, it should no longer come as a surprise that the notion of topic has often been conflated with that of referential givenness. In the eyes of Reinhart (1981: 61), the confusion is indeed fully understandable: “The apparent appeal of this approach is that it is simpler and it rests on somewhat better understood notion than pragmatic aboutness”. As a matter of fact, the concept of referential givenness can in actual practice be quite a good, i.e. objective, means to identify the topic. Relational givenness/newness is a rather personal affair, for the *speaker* decides what he presents as the most prominent information.<sup>13</sup> Therefore, judgments about what constitutes a topic and what a focus can be “distressingly subjective” (Goldstein 2008: 2). Conversely, with regard to referential givenness/newness, the speaker has no choice in the matter, since the only way of judging referential givenness is through the actual presence or derivability of an element in the context. Whether this then corresponds to the speaker’s assumptions is not really relevant (Geluykens 1992: 12; Gundel & Fretheim 2004: 178).

---

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Givón (1976: 152 & 160); Kirtchuk-Halevi (2004: 2); Gundel & Fretheim (2004: 179).

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Morgan (1975: 434); Prince (1981); S. Dik (1997<sup>2</sup>: 326); H. Dik (2007: 31f.); cf. *infra* 5.2.1.3.3.

### 2.4.2 Vs. discourse topic

Furthermore, we should also distinguish the topic in this strict (linguistic) sense from the notion of discourse topic. With “discourse topic” or “text(ual) topic” (in the terminology of van Dijk 1977), one refers to the central (summarising, global) idea of a stretch of connected discourse, to its subject matter (S. Dik 1997<sup>2</sup>: 314). In this sense, it more closely resembles our daily use of the term, as in “what was the topic of the conversation you had with your supervisor last Friday?”.<sup>14</sup>

As could be expected, this notion is sometimes conflated with the above outlined notion of topic, which is then specified as the “*sentence topic*”.<sup>15</sup> In my view, this designation is somewhat ill-chosen, for it again refers to the unit par excellence in traditional linguistic approaches (cf. supra 2.1). However, the distinction between discourse and sentence topics has been elaborated by van Dijk (1977) and by Reinhart (1981). Whereas the strictly linguistic sentence topic must be situated at the level of the sentence (sentence topics must correspond to a linguistic expression in the sentence) and its scope is thus rather limited or local, the discourse topic is what the whole discourse is about and belongs to a more global level (van Dijk 1977: 57; cf. Vermeulen 2010).

Again, these two notions cannot be entirely dissociated from each other, though: sentence topics and discourse topics are clearly closely linked. The referent introduced by a sentence topic often functions as a discourse topic and continues to do so in the subsequent discourse (van Dijk 1977: 59; cf. Vermeulen 2010).

### 2.4.3 Subclassifications

Finally, it should be mentioned that various subclassifications of the topic/focus pair have been proposed, especially with regard to the notion of focus (Kening 2008: 760). “Contrastive/identificational focus”, “new focus”, “presentational focus”, “weak focus”, “additional focus”, “informational focus”, “bound focus”, “broad focus”, “narrow focus” and “contrastive topic” are but a few of the subtypes (cf. infra 5.2.1.1). As expected, there is no agreement among linguists on the (number and interpretation of) subtypes.

---

<sup>14</sup> In my case, the answer is “go-around landings, extremely spicy food and youth traumas in zoos”; cf. supra acknowledgments.

<sup>15</sup> Lambrecht (1994: 117) also speaks of “clause topic”.

Geluykens (1992: 6) even cites the field of topic/focus as a typical example of the theoretical confusion in modern linguistics:

“there are too many preconceived, apriori notions and unoperational definitions, in short an abundance of theoretical apparatus which is insufficiently motivated by the data. A good example of this is the literature on topicality and givenness”

However, I will not go deeply into all these subtypes, for the above explained reasons: they have no practical application to my corpus and are therefore theoretically unattractive and unnecessary for my purpose (cf. supra 2.2.2).

## 2.5 Discourse markers

The phenomenon of DMs is the third and final concept which I will outline. Once more, the relation between this concept and more traditional linguistic approaches is problematic: DMs have long been neglected and have even been said not to belong to syntax proper. In present-day IS research, though, the industry of DMs has truly exploded. However, that is not tantamount to saying that DMs are now studied *exclusively* within the theory of IS: DMs have also been investigated in a number of other frameworks, such as generative linguistics, sociolinguistics and language acquisition (cf. Schourup 1999: 228). Nonetheless, being important means to structure information, DMs definitely deserve a place in this theoretical chapter on IS. More concretely, I will sketch their semantic (2.5.1), syntactic (2.5.2) and prosodic properties (2.5.3). Finally, I will exemplify these features by discussing a typical type of DM, i.e. a DM signalling a topic switch (2.5.4).

### 2.5.1 Semantics

#### 2.5.1.1 Procedural meaning

Again, much confusion exists in the terminology surrounding the concept of DMs. There are so many studies on DMs that Fischer (2006: 1) declares that it is by now almost impossible to find one's way through this jungle of publications. However, it seems to be agreed upon that DMs belong to a class of elements which contribute little to the conceptual content of the utterance and thus have procedural rather than conceptual meaning. While conceptual elements, such as “book” or “bookshop”, are easily brought

to consciousness, items with procedural meaning, such as “like” and “so”, are notoriously hard to pin down in conceptual terms.<sup>16</sup>

Nonetheless, DMs are far from being useless. Especially the ground-breaking work of Schiffrin (1987) has shown that DMs are not, as used to be claimed, completely “meaningless”.<sup>17</sup> Rather, the function of these elements must be sought at the pragmatic level. In the most simple terms, the contribution of DMs to the discourse is to provide processing instructions rather than conveying conceptual content: they help to process the message by structuring the discourse in one way or another, as Carston (2002: 162) observes: “they indicate, guide, constrain, or direct the inferential phase of comprehension”.

Since they usually *mark* relations in a *discourse*, they have received the label “discourse markers” (DMs). According to Fischer (2006: 5), the term “discourse marker” is both “the most widespread” and “the most inclusive” (cf. Brinton 1996: 29). However, we find several other synonyms, such as “pragmatic marker”, “connective”, “discourse particle” and “discourse operator”. Longacre (1976) even labels them “mystery particles”. Brinton (1996: 29) lists more than twenty such terms (cf. Schourup 1999: 227), so that it is fairly obvious that to date no agreement has been reached regarding fundamental issues of terminology (Uygur-Distexhe 2010: 75; fn 34).

### 2.5.1.2 Interpersonal and textual function

More problematically, there is also no agreement on how to define exactly the class of DMs (Jucker & Smith 1998: 171). In the absence of a generally agreed upon definition, Brinton (1996: 33ff.) has made a list of frequently maintained criteria to identify an element as a DM. This summarising list now seems to be accepted as standard. It has, for instance, been adopted by Jucker & Ziv (1998) in their monograph on DMs.

Nonetheless, the various definitions generally point to two established pragmatic functions of DMs: a textual and an interpersonal function (Brinton 1996: 29ff.; cf. Fraser 1999). In the latter function, DMs clarify the relation between the speaker and the hearer: DMs help the listener in the process of decoding the message that the speaker

---

<sup>16</sup> Relevance Theory most clearly defines the conceptual vs. procedural distinction; cf. Wilson & Sperber (1993: 16); Carston (2002: 162); Hall (2007: 153ff.); Schourup (2011: 2120). For a clear theoretical overview, see Carston (2002) and Iten (2005).

<sup>17</sup> Roughly at the same time, two other proposals were launched, namely Blakemore (1987) and Fraser (1988), so that we can say that the study of DMs has flourished at least since the year 1987.

wants to convey (Brinton 1996: 31). This use thus refers to the nature of the social exchange. Frequently quoted examples of interpersonal DMs are *you know* and *I mean*.

The textual function of DMs points to the fact that they can operate as conduits between different segments of a text/discourse (e.g. scenes, paragraphs,...): in this extent, DMs link the message to prior discourse or, somewhat differently, signal sequential discourse relationships (Fraser 1990: 387ff.). *After all* and *furthermore* are considered typical textual DMs.

However, we cannot draw a sharp line between these two categories: DMs can play a part on both the interpersonal and the textual level, operating on several levels simultaneously (Jucker & Ziv 1998: 3).<sup>18</sup> As a matter of fact, the multifunctional character has almost become a given in the study of DMs. Matei (2010: 123) even considers it “probably the most agreed upon feature of these items”.

### 2.5.1.3 Continuum from conceptual to procedural

Moreover, we can neither draw a sharp line between the conceptual and the procedural meaning of an item. Consequently, the distinction conceptual versus procedural and thus the membership of the class of DMs is best conceived as a continuum: it goes from more prototypical members to more peripheral ones (Jucker & Ziv 1998: 2f.). This is a logical consequence of the development of DMs – more precisely: of their origin –, for they usually arise out of conceptual meanings and gradually evolve into elements having procedural meaning (Traugott & Dasher 2001: 156). As is logical, the procedural meaning often stays closely connected with the “original” conceptual one. Thus, even when having developed a procedural meaning, the element in question does not necessarily lose its conceptual meaning, so that both uses may coexist (cf. Schiffrin 1987: 328; Fraser 1999: 931).

As a consequence, it is often difficult to distinguish between the “normal” use and the use as a “pure” DM. Concerning the Latin DM *quaeso*, for instance, Molinelli (2010: 183f.) remarks that there exists a continuum from *quaeso*, as a verb with full syntactic and semantic features (“to appeal to”), to *quaeso* used as a pragmatically motivated item. Especially with regard to adverbs, which are a common source of DMs (as we will see; cf. infra 2.5.2.1), this difficulty has been reported. As such, some instances are best situated

---

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Fischer (2006); Petukhova & Bunt (2009).

Admittedly, in the end, all textual DMs also serve an interpersonal purpose, as they ultimately aim at a successful interaction between speaker and hearer.

on the very borderline between the adverbial conceptual meaning and the function of DM (Loudová 2009a: 194; cf. Conti 2012a).

#### 2.5.1.4 Grammaticalisation

The gradual evolution of conceptual expressions into DMs has been described as a process of grammaticalisation (Traugott 1995; cf. Brinton 1996: 65). Conversely, a number of researchers argue that we should keep the development of items into DMs on the one hand and the development of items into other grammaticalised elements (e.g. function words, auxiliary verbs) on the other theoretically distinct. As such, they argue that it is better to speak of “pragmatic(al)isation” in the case of DMs (e.g. Aijmer 1997). However, they admit that both evolutions do share some paths. Some even argue that pragmatic(al)isation is a subclass of grammaticalisation (Traugott 1995; Diewald 2011). In what follows, I will use the more widely-spread notion of grammaticalisation.

An important step in the grammaticalisation process is “semantic bleaching” (or “desemanticisation”), which is traditionally defined as “the partial effacement of a morpheme’s semantic features, the stripping away of some of its precise content so it can be used in an abstracter, grammatical-hardware-like way” (Matisoff 1991: 384). As such, DMs are “seemingly empty” and are thus difficult to specify lexically (Brinton 1996: 29ff.). The frequency of the expression in question has been considered a prerequisite for grammaticalisation: only when an expression occurs often, it can diminish in its conceptual load and take on a more generalised meaning (Anaxagorou 1998: 141; cf. Brinton 1996: 22).

Getting a fairly fixed form, i.e. “fossilisation” (or “ossification” or “crystallisation”), is also part of the process of grammaticalisation (cf. Traugott 1995: 2).<sup>19</sup> A nice example of this is the Italian DM *dai* (“give!”):

“the morphosyntactic crystallization of these forms is visible in the lack of agreement in number with the juxtaposed imperative. (...) the speaker uses ‘dai’ (second person singular) to address a plural interlocutor” (Fedriani, Ghezzi & Molinelli 2012: 6)

With regard to DMs which originally consisted of several distinct words, this might lead to a different spelling: the words might become written as a single word, for they are now conceived as a fixed word-like unit. Think, for instance, of *anyway* or *indeed*: the different parts which made up the expression, c.q. *any* & *way* and *in* & *deed*, are no

---

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Brinton (1996: 212 & 2005: 291).

longer perceived as such (cf. Traugott 1995: 14). Lately, *you know* also tends to be spelled as *y'know* (cf. Schiffrin 1987) (this evolution is of course connected with the phonological reduction which the DM undergoes; cf. *infra* 2.5.3.1).

### 2.5.1.5 Translational difficulties

As a result of their multifunctionality and semantic shallowness, DMs are often attributed various – unsatisfactory – meanings. This becomes especially clear when they have to be translated into other languages. Translating DMs is extremely difficult, since it usually does not make sense to translate them literally. That is why they are often simply omitted from the translation (Brinton 1996: 34; Aijmer & Simon-Vandenberghe 2011: 236).

## 2.5.2 Syntax

### 2.5.2.1 Syntactically diverse sources

The multifunctionality of the class of DMs is reflected in its syntactic diversity: it includes single-word items such as *so* as well as phrases such as *you see* (Brinton 1996: 29f.). As these two examples suggest, two common sources of DMs are adverbs and verbs.

#### *Adverbs*

As such, Traugott & Dasher (2001) devote a separate chapter to adverbial DMs (“The Development of Adverbials with Discourse Marker Function”). Especially temporal adverbs seem potential candidates (Jiménez Delgado 2013: 33). For instance, Pons Bordería (1998: 148ff.) and Martín-Portolés (1999: 4107) discuss Spanish *entonces*, Schiffrin (1987: 228ff.) does the same for English *now* and *then*. Fraser (2006: 197) even makes a separate list of English temporal DMs. Hence, we can conclude with Lyavdansky (2010: 79) that “the categorial shift from temporal deictic adverb to discourse marker is observed in many languages of the world”.

The addition “deictic” is relevant as well, as deictics, including demonstratives, also seem to have an inclination to become (usually textual) DMs, for they have a natural linking function in discourse (Jiménez Delgado 2013: 40). As a matter of fact, many of the temporal adverbs having developed procedural meaning are at the same time deictics. Think, for instance, of *now* and *then*, whose deictic properties do have an impact on their use as DMs according to Schiffrin (1987: 228) (cf. *infra* 5.3.2.2.1).



## Verbs

Next to adverbs, verbs as well constitute a word class which often serves as a “reservoir” for future DMs, because verbs are prone to grammaticalise into DMs (Company Company 2006: 104; Bolly & Degand 2013). As such, Ghezzi & Molinelli (2014) speak of “verb-based pragmatic markers”. Urmson (1952: 491) actually compares these verbal DMs to adverbs: “They function rather like a certain class of adverbs”.

Most verbal DMs are derived from epistemic and reporting verbs (Kaltenböck 2007: 42; cf. *infra* 5.3.2.2.1). As examples of DMs originated from epistemic verbs, we can cite *you know* (Schiffrin 1987), *I think* (Aijmer 1997) and *I know* (Brinton 1996: 212). With regard to DMs derived from reporting verbs, Brinton (2008: 73) devotes a whole book chapter to English DMs based on the verb *to say*, in which she distinguishes their different pragmatic functions. Introducing a question is one of them, for instance: “Say, can you lend me a dime?” (Lee 2003: 134; cf. Brinton 2008: 76f.).<sup>20</sup>

The mood of a verb can also facilitate the development into a DM: the imperative form in particular regularly develops into a DM (Brinton 2008: 41; cf. Fagard 2010). Brinton (2010: 295) attempts to explain why imperatives are so prone to grammaticalisation:

“The imperative has the implicature that the speaker has something important to say that requires the attention of the hearer (i.e. “Listen to me I have something important to say”). Because of this implicature, the imperative lends itself to “improper use” in contexts where the speaker wishes to interrupt or self-select at turn-taking. This improper use underlies its function as a discourse marker”

Especially the second person *singular* seems a plausible candidate (Biraud 2010: 29; Fedriani, Ghezzi & Molinelli 2012: 5). To give a concrete example, I can cite Modern Greek μαθέ(ς) (“learn!”), which is actually considered an adverb (επίρρημα) in dictionaries, such as Babiniotis’ (1998: 1041):

“μαθέ: επίρρ. (λαϊκ.) 1. βεβαίως: δεν θέλει ~ να μας πει πού πήγε, γιατί φοβάται || ναι ~ (ως απόκριση βεβαιότατα) 2. δηλαδή, όπως είναι εμφανές: θέλει ~ να μας κάνει τον σπουδαίο. Επίσης μαθέ(ς) [μεσν.]”

---

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Lee (2003; fn 60) for an overview of the English DM *say*.

The dictionary of Pring (1975<sup>2</sup>: 115) too devotes a separate lemma to this word: “μαθέ(ς): adv. certainly, apparently; by any chance?”. Think also of expressions such as *look* (Brinton 2001) and *guarda* (Waltereit 2002).<sup>21</sup>

### 2.5.2.2 Lack of syntactic modifiers

In general, grammaticalised items lose their ability to take complements or to be specified by other elements (Company Company 2006: 100; Brinton 2008: 51). Thus, when an expression is syntactically modified, we can assume that it has retained its conceptual meaning. Hence, DMs typically *lack* modifiers. Naturally, the nature of these (missing) modifiers differ according to the DM’s origin.

#### *Verbs*

Verbal DMs are usually no longer accompanied by arguments, such as the (in)direct object, since arguments help to complete the verb’s conceptual meaning. Fagard (2010: 256), for instance, remarks about the verbal (even imperatival) DM *look*:<sup>22</sup>

“The syntactic features of Romance *look*-forms also clearly indicate that they have undergone or are undergoing a process of grammaticalization. In most instances, these forms do not accept objects or subjects, thus rejecting an analysis as centre of a verb phrase”

The direct object often takes the form of a *that*-clause. When used as DMs, the verbs are thus expected to lack *that*-complementation. This has been proven to be the case for *tu vois* (Bolly 2014), *I know* (Brinton 1996: 211), *say* (Brinton 2005: 291) and *I think* (Aijmer 1997: 8). Dehé & Wichmann (2010: 8) even compare *I think* without the complementiser “that” with an epistemic adverb.

Beside arguments, ad-verbs – as their name reveals – modify the (conceptual) content of the verb and their presence thus also favours a conceptual interpretation of the verb in question. Consequently, verbs which are to enter the grammaticalisation cline will usually *lack* adverbs (or adverbially used expressions). Indeed, it seems much less likely that a phrase such as “you see *in detail*” would develop procedural meaning.

---

<sup>21</sup> Marín Jordà (2005: 57) adds Catalan/Portuguese *aviam*, *a veure*, *miri*, *escolti*.

<sup>22</sup> Marín Jordà (2005: 52) observes the same with respect to Catalan *a veure*.

## Adverbs

This consequence of the process of grammaticalisation is not only visible with regard to verbal DMs; adverbial DMs too lack modifiers (Conti 2012a&b). As such, the loss of modifiers is also a typical step in the grammaticalisation process (often called a process of “deategorialisation”; cf. Brinton 2005: 291).

### 2.5.2.3 Syntactic independence

A final yet crucial syntactic characteristic of DMs is their independence, i.e. a preference for a position *outside* the proper sentence (Fischer 2006: 8). As a result, DMs are sometimes said to be easily omitted from the utterance without disturbing its correctness – at least from a purely syntactic point of view.<sup>23</sup> In this light, we should interpret Brinton’s (1996: 212) description of DMs as “optional items”.

## Verbs

The syntactic independence can clearly be seen in the case of the verbal DMs: these verbs are syntactically independent from the sentence/clause in which they appear and thus interrupt the grammatical structure (Kaltenböck 2005: 22). Consequently, they belong to the class of “parentheticals”, which are defined by Dehé & Kavalova (2007: 1) as “expressions that are linearly represented in a given string of utterance (a host sentence), but seem structurally independent at the same time” (cf. Dehé 2014: 1). “Parentheticals” is actually an umbrella term for a class of expressions which is very heterogeneous from a syntactic and semantic point of view, containing adverbs (e.g. *unfortunately*), short clauses (e.g. *what’s it called?*), modal/epistemic verbs (e.g. *I suppose*), reporting verbs (e.g. *she said*), etc. (Astruc 2005: 10). Vocatives are sometimes also reckoned among the class of parentheticals (Schwyzer 1939).<sup>24</sup> The fact that the members of this quite mixed class interrupt the grammatical structure is often reflected by punctuation in written language (commas or dashes surrounding the parenthetical).

On that account, verbal DMs, such as *I know*, *I mean*, *you see* and *you know*, have been labelled parenthetical verbs (Urmson 1952). Parenthetical verbs can usually be recognised by the fact that they differ from their surrounding verbs, with which they are obviously never coordinated. Moreover, they may have a different person and

---

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Schiffrin (1987: 31f.); Astruc (2005).

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Wichmann (2001); Astruc (2005); cf. *infra* 5.1.3.5 & 5.3.4.3.

number than the surrounding verbs (Biraud 2010: 27) and do often not follow sequence of tense (Brinton 2008: 7). Furthermore, in modern languages parenthetically used verbs can normally also be identified on the basis of prosodic means (cf. *infra* 2.5.3).

Although not all parenthetically used verbs can of course automatically be assigned DM status, the tendency of parenthetical verbs to become DMs seems strong (Lewis 2006: 55). Indeed, their parenthetical status without doubt facilitates the grammaticalisation process: parenthetically used verbs can easily become semantically bleached and develop (usually interpersonal) procedural meanings (Aijmer 1997: 7). To complicate matters even more, these verbal DMs have also been called “comment clauses”.<sup>25</sup> To avoid confusion, I will speak of “parenthetical verbal DMs”.

### *Adverbs*

On the other hand, the syntactic independence of adverbial DMs is often “translated” into a preference for initial position (Traugott 1995: 6). Pioneer Schiffrin (1987: 328) lists the common occurrence in initial position among the conditions allowing an expression to be used as a DM (cf. Archakis 2001: 1237). Fraser (1999: 938; fn 8) even claims that almost all DMs occur in initial position.<sup>26</sup> This preference of adverbial DMs for initial position can be explained as a result of their syntactic independence, since initial position can be considered a syntactically more marginal slot than an internal position (Crespo 2011: 37). Moreover, from this initial position, the adverbial DMs have scope over the rest of the utterance rather than that they solely modify the verb (Jiménez Delgado 2013: 36). Schourup (1999: 233) also recognises this:

“The tendency of DMs to appear initially is probably related to their ‘superordinate’ use to restrict the contextual interpretation of an utterance: in general it will make communicative sense to restrict contexts early before interpretation can run astray”

Thus, the position of an adverb seems often correlated with difference of meaning (Traugott 1995: 6; Traugott & Dasher 2001: 158). The example which Traugott (1995: 6) cites is: “She spoke well” (internal position: conceptual meaning) vs. “Well, she spoke” (initial position: procedural meaning). As this example shows, punctuation might again reflect the syntactic independence: the DM can be followed by a comma (cf. *supra* 2.5.2.3).

---

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Brinton (1996: 211); Dehé & Wichmann (2010); Schneider (2007).

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Georgakopoulou & Goutsos (1998: 911); Archakis (2001: 1237); Aijmer & Simon-Vandenberghe (2011: 7).

Nonetheless, that is not to say that *all* adverbial DMs stand in initial position and *all* verbal DMs occur parenthetically. DMs might also occupy other positions; they do not occupy a fixed position (Brinton 1996: 33; Rouchota 1998: 102).

### 2.5.3 Prosody

#### 2.5.3.1 Phonological reduction

Prosodically, the most marked properties of DMs is that they are often unstressed (Brinton 1996: 33).<sup>27</sup> As a consequence, DMs are often short and subject to phonological reduction (or “erosion” or “attrition”) (Schiffrin 1987: 328; Brinton 1996: 33). Note that phonological reduction is another process that is linked to grammaticalisation.

#### 2.5.3.2 Typical of spoken discourse

Another acknowledged feature of DMs is the fact that they are characteristic of speech rather than of writing (Lyavdansky 2010: 81).<sup>28</sup> Fagard (2010: 258) relates this observation to the small number of diachronic studies on DMs: “the fact that DMs are spoken elements par excellence makes it hard to use written texts to study their development”. Moreover, they tend to appear with high frequency in spoken language (Brinton 1996: 33; cf. Wichmann 2001: 177). In this context, it is relevant to give pioneer Schiffrin’s (1987: 31) very general definition of DMs: a DM is an “element which brackets units of talk”.

#### 2.5.3.3 Relation with IU

This – vague – definition might raise the question of how DMs relate to IUs, our well-established “units of talk” (cf. *supra* 2.3). Some linguists have claimed that DMs are bracketed off by IU boundaries and that they thus constitute an independent IU.<sup>29</sup> Chafe (1993: 37) himself seems to belong to this camp: “The regulatory type includes intonation units composed of discourse markers as described by Schiffrin (1987)”. Especially the parenthetical verbal DMs have been claimed to constitute a separate IU

---

<sup>27</sup> In initial position, DMs are of course less likely to be unstressed; cf. *supra* 2.5.2.3.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Watts (1989: 208); Jucker & Ziv (1998: 3); Tree & Schrock (1999: 280); Aijmer (2004: 174); Aijmer & Simon-Vandenberg (2011: 7).

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Georgakopoulou & Goutsos (1998: 896); Aijmer (2002: 59); Lyavdansky (2010: 81); Aijmer & Simon-Vandenberg (2011: 226).

(Wichmann 2001: 180; Scheppers 2011: 8). The idea that syntactic boundaries coincide with prosodic boundaries – and thus that the prosodic independence of DMs follows from their syntactic independence – is a common assumption in standard prosodic theory (e.g. Nespor & Vogel 1986).<sup>30</sup> This view, however, should be weakened: “the prediction made by prosodic theory that parentheticals form separate intonation domains is too strong in the light of actual spoken language data” (Dehé 2007: 261).<sup>31</sup>

In sum, DMs can constitute an autonomous IU, but do not have to. In fact, with regard to DMs functioning as so-called filled pauses, DMs are better compared to IU *boundary* markers than to independent IUs.

#### 2.5.3.4 Filled pauses

Indeed, certain DMs have been related to the concept of filled pauses.<sup>32</sup> As their name betrays, filled pauses function as breathing pauses in the discourse, but contrary to real, i.e. silent, pauses, they are “filled” with a linguistic expression. Often, this expression belongs to the class of DMs:

“pause fillers, or ‘hesitation markers’, range in character from elongated vowels or nasals, to whole sentences (...), with their prototypical category members being expressions like *I mean, you know, like, well, oh, uh, and ah*” (Östman 1981: 9)<sup>33</sup>

*You know* is probably the most well-known English DM functioning as a filled pause, even though *like* is rapidly gaining in popularity and is becoming the most popular stopgap of the new generation, to the great annoyance of many adults. However, Ronald Reagan too was ridiculed for starting all his answers with *well...*

Needless to say, filled pauses are typically found in naturally spoken language (Brinton 1996: 37). They often co-occur with real, i.e. silent, breathing pauses, which they seem to reinforce. As such, these DMs are part of a longer pause, i.e. a “a transitional, hesitant phase” as Déhé & Wichmann (2010: 3) call it. In her analysis of pauses in the London-Lund corpus of spoken English, Stenström (1990: 222) too notices that filled pauses and real breathing pauses often cluster together.

---

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Astruc (2005: 1); cf. supra 2.3.3.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Schwyzer (1939: 31); Ziv (1985: 181).

<sup>32</sup> Other terms in use are “pause fillers”, “lexical fillers”, “verbal fillers” or even just “fillers” (cf. Stenström 1990: 214f.).

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Bakker (1990a: 9); Scheppers (2011: 211f.).

Since a breathing pause is one of the most oft-cited criteria to identify an IU boundary (cf. supra 2.3.1), it should not come as a surprise that DMs functioning as filled pauses are often found at IU boundaries: “Discourse markers tend to be used at utterance boundaries, and hence have strong interactions with intonational phrasing” (Heeman & Allen 1999: 531). This is confirmed by Watts (1989: 210), according to whom DMs tend to be placed either at the beginning or at the end of an IU “in order to mark off, or bracket off, one bit of information from another”.<sup>34</sup> To make the (prosodic) picture complete, DMs can thus not only constitute an IU (either completely or partly), but might also occur *between* IUs and as such reinforce an IU *boundary*.

In their function of filled pauses, DMs have even been compared to “editing markers”: “some have functions that come close to e.g. those of punctuation or paragraphing in written texts” (Erman 2001: 1339).<sup>35</sup> This is also Schneider’s (2007: 40) conclusion: according to him parenthetical verbal DMs are usually inserted where there would be a punctuation mark in written language.

Nevertheless, it should be emphasised that the comparison between pauses and DMs cannot be taken a safe-conduct to treat DMs as being mutually exchangeable – they are not simply “wild cards” (Schourup 1999: 242). Nuances between the different DMs are definitely to be distinguished, for it has been assumed that some (conceptual) core meaning of the DM always remains: “the VF [verbal filler] categories are inherently different” (Stenström 1990: 250).<sup>36</sup> Depending on the context *I mean* will, for instance, be preferred to *you know*.

Thus, rather than being “verbal garbage” (Tree & Schrock 2002: 729), DMs functioning as filled pauses have a straightforward “time stalling function” (Forchini 2010: 328). Hence, Stenström (1994) calls DMs functioning as filled pauses “stallers”.<sup>37</sup> In the same vein, Bakker (1990a: 9) reckons *you know* among “vocalization/hesitation phenomena”. Lee (2003: 22) does the same for *say* and Fagard (2010: 252) for a couple of other verbal (even imperatival) DMs (*look, regarde, guarda, kijk*). This is also confirmed by Aijmer (1997: 24) for *I think*, yet in slightly differently formulated terms: “*I think* is inserted where it is natural for the speaker to stop to plan”. These items are then still to be considered DMs, because they actually also help to structure the discourse:<sup>38</sup> by

---

<sup>34</sup> Accordingly, Watts (1989) distinguishes between left hand (at the left IU boundary) and right hand DMs (at the right IU boundary).

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Erman (2001: 1344).

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Schourup (1999: 249ff.); Dehé & Wichmann (2010: 32).

<sup>37</sup> Cf. González (2005: 64).

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Swerts (1998).

creating time for both the speaker and the hearer to respectively produce and process the message they facilitate the information flow, because they – as semantically bleached elements – require less cognitive effort than items with conceptual meaning.

#### 2.5.4 The topic switch marker

To end this subsection on DMs, I would like to point to the existence of a specific type of DMs, namely DMs that signal a topic switch – or simply “topic switch markers”. These DMs can not only signal the shift to a new topic, they can also signal the resumption of an earlier topic (Brinton 1996: 37 & 268). Confusingly, though, the notion of topic might not only refer to the proper linguistic *sentence* (or *aboutness*) topics, but also to *discourse* topics (cf. supra 2.4.2). The topic switch marker is a widely recognised category of DMs, which will also play a major role in my own analysis of (adverbial) DMs in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry (cf. infra 5.3.3). Schourup (1999: 257ff.), for instance, devotes a separate section to DMs which denote a topic switch. Lenk (1998) even sees the notion of topic as central to the description of certain DMs.<sup>39</sup>

In this context, the relevance of the topic/focus pair and of DMs with regard to the structuring of information as well as their interrelationship(s) becomes very clear (cf. Dehé & Kavalova 2007: 11). However, this is not the only place where the interface between the above outlined concepts will be apparent. Although the three concepts will receive a practical application in separate sections (cf. infra chapter 5), it will very soon become obvious that they are all interrelated.

---

<sup>39</sup> Erman (2001: 1342), for instance, believes that marking the topic is a crucial pragmatic function of the DM *you know*; cf. Schourup (1999: 258).



## Chapter 3 Corpus

My corpus consists of seven romances and one chronicle, resulting in a representative corpus of LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry of almost 35,000 verses. This reflects the fact that the romance constitutes the genre par excellence in the heyday of LMG so-called vernacular literature (3.1). After giving some general information on the genre of the Greek romance (3.2), I will introduce the particular texts which I will take into account in my linguistic analysis (3.3). Before I begin, it should be admitted that this chapter touches on issues which have at times generated considerable debate (mostly among literary theoreticians); most of these cannot be treated here in the detail they deserve.

### 3.1 The LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry and its genres

The LMG πολιτικός στίχος poems are marked out as a group by a number of formal features. The most fundamental one is the use of (a form of) the vernacular, together with the use of the πολιτικός στίχος (E. Jeffreys 2011: 469). Besides, Cupane (2003: 577) also lists their oral-formulaic character – the abundance of formulas, the anonymous authorship and a fluid manuscript tradition – as a distinguishing feature. Unsurprisingly, it is precisely these two aspects that have been problematised in research on the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry (cf. supra 1.1).

Based on the content, we can divide the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry into chronicles, animal-fables (such as the e.g. *Poulologos*), epic, satire/parody (e.g. *Spanos*), begging poetry (e.g. *Ptochoprodromic poems*), dirges and historical (warfare) poetry (e.g. the

retelling of the famous tale of the general Belisarios).<sup>1</sup> Although Cupane (2003: 577) refers to the “aller inhaltlichen Vielfalt” and E. Jeffreys (2011: 469) to the “disparate subject-matter” of the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry, one genre outshines all the others, i.e. the romance (cf. E. & M. Jeffreys 1986: 530).

In the most broad terms, the genre of the romance can be defined as a fictional narrative which shares a number of literary plots of which the most crucial one is the love of a protagonist couple (hence “romance of love”). These protagonists are usually two young aristocratic, beautiful lovers (as reflected in the titles; cf. infra 3.3.1) who experience thrilling adventures (the boy often experiencing more thrilling ones than the girl, though).

As such, the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος romances are said to constitute a recognisable genre in themselves and have always been treated as such in overviews of Greek literature (cf. Rosenqvist 2007: 172).<sup>2</sup> Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) has even devoted a separate monograph to them, on the assumption that there exists “an impressive degree of cohesion among the romances of love and adventure, both thematically and stylistically, which suggests an implicit awareness of a common genre” (Beaton 1996<sup>2</sup>: 101; cf. Horrocks 2010<sup>2</sup>: 218).<sup>3</sup> Without doubt, the romances constitute the largest group within the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry. Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>: 107) is even convinced that many more romances were in circulation during the final centuries of Byzantium. Tellingly, Horrocks (2010<sup>2</sup>: 217ff.) divides the section on the vernacular literature of the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> centuries into the romances and “other vernacular material”.<sup>4</sup> The romances are thus “in many ways conveniently representative of all early vernacular Greek verse” (M. Jeffreys 1981: 116). Therefore, we can rightly assert that the genre of the πολιτικὸς στίχος romance has played a principal part in the rise and development of the so-called vernacular – or in the words of Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>: 92):

“Much the most radical form of literary engagement with the changed world of Greek-speakers after 1204 is the sudden emergence in the early fourteenth century of the vernacular as the unchallenged medium for almost all literary fiction. The dominant role in this literary movement is played by the romance”

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Beck (1971: 147ff.); E. Jeffreys (2011: 469).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. E. Jeffreys (1981: 116); Horrocks (2010<sup>2</sup>: 217ff.); E. Jeffreys (2013: 218).

<sup>3</sup> In turn, Agapitos & Smith (1992) have conducted a reassessment of recent work on the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος romances.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>: 195ff.) under the heading “narrative poetry in related genres”.

## 3.2 The romance in the Greek tradition

The genre of the romance has a long tradition in Greek (3.2.1), yet its regained popularity in the 12<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup> centuries has mainly been ascribed to western influence (3.2.2).

### 3.2.1 Greek predecessors...

The romance is a genre which has fired the imagination of the Greeks for quite a few centuries: its roots must be traced back to the Roman Empire. From the 1<sup>st</sup> century to the 4<sup>th</sup> (Second Sophistic), five complete romances have survived (Chariton's *Chaereas & Callirhoë*; Xenophon of Ephesos' *Ephesiaka*; Achilles Tatios' *Leukippe & Klitophon*; Longos' *Daphnis & Chloë*; and Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*). These texts have been considered the ancestor of the modern novel (Beaton 1988; Doody 1996).

There is a revival in the 12<sup>th</sup> century, under the dynasty of the Komnenians. The Komnenian novels are the following ones: *Hysmine & Hysmines* by Eustathios Makrembolites, *Rodanthe & Dosikles* by Theodore Prodromos, *Drosilla & Charikles* by Niketas Eugenianos, and *Aristandros & Kallithea* by Constantine Manasses (which survives only in fragments) (Beaton 1996; E. Jeffreys 2012a). These four romances are considered the immediate predecessors of our “Byzantine vernacular romances” (Agapitos 2004: 12). As Agapitos' description suggests, the crucial point on which the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος romances diverge from their Komnenian predecessors is precisely the fact that they are written in (a form of) the vernacular, which is almost inextricably connected with the use of the πολιτικὸς στίχος (cf. supra 1.1.1):<sup>5</sup>

“The Palaiologan romances share several characteristics that mark them out as a group. Two involve the breaking of normal Byzantine stylistic patterns, an infringement for which an explanation is needed: the romances employ a register of Greek that uses more of the vernacular than was normally allowed in writing by Byzantine linguistic conventions, and they use the unrhymed fifteen-syllable verse, the so-called political verse, which was not accorded any literary merit by most Byzantine writers” (E. Jeffreys 2013: 218f.; cf. Manoussages 1952: 70)

---

<sup>5</sup> Manasses' 12<sup>th</sup> c. romance is also composed in the πολιτικὸς στίχος, though.

Moreover, all these romances date from the heyday of LMG vernacular literature, which is to be traced back to the 12<sup>th</sup> century, yet really flourishes in the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> centuries, i.e. during the last Byzantine dynasty of the Palaiologans (Hinterberger 2006: 4; cf. supra 1.1.1).<sup>6</sup> Hence, they are called the “Palaiologan romances” (E. Jeffreys 2013: 217; cf. above quotation). However, the precise date of their production as well as the sequence of composition continues to be debated (E. Jeffreys 2013: 219; cf. infra 3.3.1.2). Furthermore, note that the dating of the original texts may differ substantially from that of the manuscripts and that researchers do not agree on the latter (Manoussages 1952: 78; cf. Agapitos 2004: 12f.).

In sum, representing “the last wave of ancient Greek romances” (Cormier 1997), the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος romances thus belong to a long Greek literary tradition.

### 3.2.2 ... but also western counterparts

However, the popularity of the genre of the romance is not limited to the Greek world in the Middle Ages. In the Latin West as well, the romance constitutes the genre in which the vernacular languages are for the first time fully exploited:

“western use of the modern Romance languages for writing, especially the writing of romances, was influential in the development of a corresponding Greek idiom for the kind of fictional literature that was once again in demand during the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> centuries” (Horrocks 2010<sup>2</sup>: 216)<sup>7</sup>

The relations between East and West have been a hot topic in the literature on the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος romances: do these stories owe more to the western conventions than to their long-standing Greek literary counterparts?<sup>8</sup> Accordingly, the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος romances have in the past been divided into original romances (or at least for

---

<sup>6</sup> In this context, it might be worthwhile to note that *Digenis Akritis*, the first extant literary text in the vernacular, has been called a “proto-romance” by Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>: 30).

<sup>7</sup> Note that western influence has in general been invoked to explain why vernacular literature emerges and flourishes at that precise moment in the Greek world. Especially in the aftermath of the fourth crusade in 1204, the influence of the Latin West, which sees the development of a written form of the vernacular Romance languages beginning to compete with Latin in literature, indubitably grows in Byzantium (Marboeuf 2009: 8). The fact that *several* vernaculars develop out of Latin presents a crucial difference with the Greek situation, though (Toufexis 2008: 216).

<sup>8</sup> The topic is still not settled, witness the very recent (2013) article by E. Jeffreys entitled “Byzantine Romances: Eastern or Western?”.

which no western originals have been found) and western ones (Beck 1971; Beaton 1996<sup>2</sup>). Indeed, a number of romances are no “genuine” Greek productions: *Imberios & Margarona* is based on an Old-French original, as is the *War of Troy*, and an Italian text must have served as a model for *Phlorios & Platzia Phlora* (cf. infra 3.3).

However, this dichotomy has found to be too simplistic: according to E. Jeffreys (2013: 233), *all πολιτικὸς στίχος* romances are the result of an ideological blending; their background is both eastern and western (cf. Betts 1995). Furthermore, the “western” Greek romances are reworkings rather than simple translations: Browning (1999<sup>2</sup>: 74) warns that “we must not speak of translations”. Thus, a sharp twofold distinction between genuine and western romances is artificial and unfounded (cf. Moennig 2004: 41ff.). As a consequence, I see absolutely no harm in including allegedly western romances in my corpus (cf. infra 3.3).

In conclusion, we can say that the romance constitutes the *πολιτικὸς στίχος* poem κατ’ ἐξοχήν in the Middle Ages.

### 3.3 The particular texts

My presentation of the particular texts included in my corpus (3.3.1) and their editions (3.3.2) will be concise. There is much more to be said about these texts, especially when taking into consideration literary oriented research (such as studies on shared literary motifs, like the garden, the castle, the concept of Eros and chivalric elements).<sup>9</sup> Narratological investigations in particular have yielded fruitful insights.<sup>10</sup> However, I will not involve any of these studies, so as to save room for the actual purpose of this dissertation: a modern linguistic approach. For the same purpose, I have also refrained from giving a summary of each story and I have decided not to include much details on the circumstances of each text, such as the precise location and the reception (on which it is very difficult to make generalising statements)<sup>11</sup>, nor on the manuscripts. For this

---

<sup>9</sup> However, on the literary plane as well, much work remains to be done; Cormier (1997) speaks of “a fascinating but sadly-neglected niche of medieval literature”. Modern (English) translations, for instance, are still lacking for certain texts.

<sup>10</sup> E.g. Agapitos (1991) on *Kallimachos & Chrysorroï*, *Velthandros & Chrysandza* and *Livistros & Rodamni*; Marboeuf (2009) and Shawcross (2009) on the *Chronicle of Morea*.

<sup>11</sup> However, most authors have been associated with the court of Constantinople (Beaton 1996<sup>2</sup>: 104).

kind of information, I refer to the respective editions, as well as to the monograph of Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>), which has become the standard work on the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος romance.<sup>12</sup> Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) not only applies sophisticated methods of literary analysis to the material, he also cites many further references. The “Study of Medieval Greek Romance: A Reassessment of Recent Work” by Agapitos & Smith (1992) is helpful as well.<sup>13</sup>

### 3.3.1 Selection of the stories

#### 3.3.1.1 Seven romances

My corpus contains eight πολιτικὸς στίχος poems, of which all but one are considered romances. The following four have been said to be “original” romances: *Achilleïs Byzantina* (AB); *Velthandrus & Chrysandza* (VC); *Ilias Byzantina* (IB) and *Livistros & Rodamni* (LR). On the other hand, *Imberios & Margarona* (IM); *Phlorios & Platzia Phlora* (PP) and the *War of Troy* (BT<sup>14</sup>) are western adaptations. This is the division maintained in Beaton’s (1996<sup>2</sup>) monograph. As regards the last text, a short word is in order, as it has long been neglected (e.g. Manoussages 1952):

“There is also another text which (...) despite clearly belonging with the group, has been almost entirely ignored in discussions of these romances. This is the War of Troy (...) it shares the romances’ characteristic features: it is anonymous, in the fifteen-syllable line, with repeated phrases and a fluid textual tradition, and uses a form of the vernacular (...). There are probably several reasons for its neglect: its length, its delayed publication, and a perception that it is not a romance, because its subject is war and not love. But there are in fact twin themes: war and love, *amor et militia*. Love is the trigger for the wars” (E. Jeffreys 2013: 224)

Indeed, the story contains three love affairs: Jason and Medea, Achilles and Polyxene and even a threesome between Diomedes, Briseida and Troilos (E. Jeffreys 2013: 224).

Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) adds a number of texts which I have omitted from my analysis. The best-known of these is *Kallimachos & Chrysorroï*, which is traditionally considered a genuine Greek story. I have excluded this text, because it is generally acknowledged to

---

<sup>12</sup> Albeit a bit older, Beck’s “Geschichte der byzantinischen Volksliteratur” (1971) is also still a very useful source of information; cf. E. Jeffreys (1979 & 1981); E. & M. Jeffreys (1983); Smith (1996).

<sup>13</sup> Older references are to be found in the by now outdated Krumbacher (1897<sup>2</sup>).

<sup>14</sup> This abbreviation is derived from its Latin title *Bellum Troianum*.

be much less vernacular than the others: “The language in which this romance is written contains a much higher proportion of learned forms, superimposed on a vernacular base, than we find in any of the other romances of this period” (Beaton 1996<sup>2</sup>: 118).<sup>15</sup> Accordingly, the poet is assumed to have a learned background (Horrocks 2010<sup>2</sup>: 344). As a matter of fact, the writer is known by name (Andronikos Palaiologos, a member of the court at Constantinople), which also sets this text apart from the other – all anonymous – romances (Beaton 1996<sup>2</sup>: 104).

Under the heading of romances adapted after western models, Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>: 140ff.) also discusses three other texts: *Apollonios of Tyre*; Boccaccio’s *Teseida* and the Arthurian cycle. These are also all excluded from my corpus. Although the Greek version of Boccaccio’s *Teseida* is composed in the πολιτικός στίχος, it is modelled after a rhymed Italian verse format (ottava rima) and thus uses an unusual rhyme scheme (Beaton 1996<sup>2</sup>: 140).<sup>16</sup> As for the Greek version of the Arthurian cycle, only one episode survives: *The Old Knight*.<sup>17</sup> I consider this “fragment”, as Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>: 252; fn 1) calls it, too short to include (307 verses).

The story of Apollonios has also been omitted, because it belongs to a (slightly) different tradition than the other romances: “This is the only one of the translated which has no chivalric elements. Instead its story goes back by a direct tradition to late antiquity” (Beaton 1996<sup>2</sup>: 140f.).<sup>18</sup> The same can be said of the 14<sup>th</sup> c. Alexander romance, which Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) discusses among the “narrative poetry in related genres” rather than under the heading of the romances proper: it actually belongs to a longstanding separate tradition of reworkings of this popular story (cf. Beck 1971: 133; cf. M. Jeffreys 1973: 176).<sup>19</sup> The fact that this text is part of another tradition seems to be reflected in its lack of formulaic phrases, which is just a distinctive feature of the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry (M. Jeffreys 1973: 176; cf. supra 1.1.2.2.1). Finally, the recently discovered and edited *Alexander & Semiramis* (not yet mentioned by Beaton 1996<sup>2</sup>) is also not taken into account, for it has a slightly different character as well: *Alexander & Semiramis* presents us with the only attested “oriental” tale (Agapitos 2006b: 165), since more eastern – Turkish – than western influence is detected (cf. E. Jeffreys 2007: 871).<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Cf. M. Jeffreys (1975a: 188); Manolossou (2002: 125); Odorico (2005); Horrocks (2010<sup>2</sup>: 345).

<sup>16</sup> Later on rhyme becomes popular in Byzantium: a number of LMG πολιτικός στίχος romances have been recast in rhymed form.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>: 143); Rizzo Nervo (2000).

<sup>18</sup> More precisely, it goes back to a Latin romance of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century (Beck 1971: 135; Beaton 1996<sup>2</sup>: 140f.).

<sup>19</sup> Moreover, this text seems to have been little read, unlike most of the romances (Beaton 1996<sup>2</sup>: 196).

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Moennig (2004); Agapitos (2006b: 165ff.).

It might have become clear that drawing up an exhaustive record of the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος romances is a more arbitrary task than one might first think, as Agapitos (2004: 12) testifies:

“Let us move on to the texts I have been referring to as Byzantine vernacular romances. How many are they and which exactly? The seemingly simple question proves more difficult than one would have expected (...) They float around the general heading ‘romance of chivalry’”<sup>21</sup>

This is also indicated by Salas (1998b: 323): “Los textos reconocidos como novelas de caballería de época paleóloga, sin que haya unanimidad al respecto, son *Calímaco y Crisorroe*, *Beltandro y Crisantsa*, *Libistro y Rodamni*, *Florio y Platzia Flora*, *Imberio y Margarona*, *la Aquileida* y *la Guerra de Troya*” (the *Ilias Byzantina*, for instance, is left out). As such, inventories of the Palaiologan romances vary considerably. In a very recent “catalogue” of the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος romances, for instance, E. Jeffreys (2011: 469; fn 50) lists *Alexander & Semiramis*, *Achilleïs Byzantina*, *Ilias Byzantina*, *Kallimachos & Chrysorroi*, *Imberios & Margarona*, *Livistros & Rodamni*, *Phlorios & Platzia Phlora*, *Velthandros & Chrysandza* and the *War of Troy*, but also the rather obscure *On Good and Bad Fortune*<sup>22</sup>, which Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>: 195) considers among the “narrative poetry in related genres” and Beck (1971: 147) labels “ein moralisirendes Gedicht”.<sup>23</sup>

Actually, this “arbitrariness” is also reflected in the editions and translations of the Palaiologan romances, as well as in the survey books of Byzantine literature. Rosenqvist (2007: 169f.), for instance, briefly discusses the romances *Kallimachos & Chrysorroi*, *Livistros & Rodamni*, *Velthandros & Chrysandza*, *Achilleïs Byzantina*, *Phlorios & Platzia Phlora* and *Imberios & Margarona*, but neglects the *War of Troy* and the *Ilias Byzantina*. Wagner (1881) chose to edit (a version of) the *Alexander* romance, *Achilleïs Byzantina* and *Livistros & Rodamni* in his book “Trois poèmes grecs du Moyen-Age”, while Kriaras (1955) includes *Kallimachos & Chrysorroi*, *Velthandros & Chrysandza*, *Phlorios & Platzia Phlora* and *Imberios & Margarona* in his edition of the anthology “Βυζαντινὰ Ἱπποτικά Μυθιστορήματα”. Betts (1995) translated *Velthandros & Chrysandza*, *Kallimachos & Chrysorroi* and *Livistros &*

---

<sup>21</sup> “Romances of chivalry” is indeed another common description of the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος romances, which refers to the link with the West; cf. Manoussages (1952): “les romans byzantins de chevalerie”.

<sup>22</sup> This story has been edited by Cupane (1995) under the Italian title *Favola consolatoria sulla Cattiva e la Buona Sorte*.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Politi-Sakellaridi’s (1987) article “Προβλήματα της έκδοσης του ‘Λόγου Παρηγορητικού περί Δυστυχίας καὶ Ευτυχίας’”.



Rodamni into English, while Cupane (1995) makes *Velthandros & Chrysandza*, *Achilleïs Byzantina* and *Phlorios & Platzia Phlora* accessible for Italian readers.

The same holds for the studies on specific grammatical aspects in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry (cf. supra preface & 1.2.2.1). In his analysis of the distribution of the object clitic pronouns, Pappas (2004: 19ff.), for instance, does take into consideration the *Achilleïs Byzantina*, *Kallimachos & Chrysorroi*, *Livistros & Rodamni* and *Phlorios & Platzia Phlora*, but omits the *War of Troy*, the *Ílias Byzantina* and *Imberios & Margarona*. In her article on morphological variation, Chábová (2010) solely focuses on *Velthandros & Chrysandza*, *Kallimachos & Chrysorroi*, *Imberios & Margarona* and *Phlorios & Platzia Phlora* (cf. supra 1.1.1.2.1).

As a consequence, I am aware of the fact that my selection of the above mentioned seven romances might also risk having an arbitrary character. However, I have made sure that my corpus includes the best-known texts, i.e. those texts which occur in every list. Including *all* the texts which have once been called a “romance” (as well as all their versions, cf. infra 3.3.2) would simply have been unrealistic with regard to my purpose. I have taken special care to keep my corpus manageable: a corpus of almost 35,000 words (including the *Chronicle of Morea*; cf. immediately infra) is large enough to be subject to statistical analysis, but small enough to grasp the pragmatic nuances of the texts, a prerequisite for a modern linguistic analysis in terms of IS.

### 3.3.1.2 One chronicle

Finally, I have also taken into account a text which belongs to the genre of the chronicle, namely the anonymous *Chronicle of Morea* (CoM), which Rosenqvist (2007: 172) calls “die bekannteste der spätbyzantinischen Verschroniken”.<sup>24</sup> The *Chronicle of Morea* survives in versions in four different languages: Italian, Aragonese, French and (vernacular) Greek (Shawcross 2009: 33). The debate on which version is closest to the original has centered round the French and Greek versions (M. Jeffreys 1975b: 304).<sup>25</sup> The Greek version is the only one not written in prose, but in the πολιτικὸς στίχος (which in my view further promotes the naturalness of this metre; cf. infra 4.1.4). Marboeuf (2009 : 21) sees in this evidence for the priority of the Greek version:<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> The other chronicle written in this period is the *Chronicle of the Tocco*, which is also composed in vernacular πολιτικοὶ στίχοι (Beck 1971: 159f.; Rosenqvist 2007: 173).

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Schmitt (1904); Bees (1917); Lurier (1964); Topping (1965).

<sup>26</sup> Cf. M. Jeffreys (1973).

“Nous venons de voir que la transmission en plusieurs manuscrits de la version grecque et sa composition en vers politiques donnent à penser qu’il s’agit d’une œuvre originale, authentiquement grecque, qui se rattache à une tradition orale de l’époque médiévale”

Moreover, the Greek version of the *Chronicle of Morea* also shares the other formal features of the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος romances (which are typical for the πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry in general). To begin with, the *Chronicle of Morea* is usually considered the text “closest to the vernacular” (Manolessou 2002: 125) of all the preserved LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poems, as Horrocks (2010<sup>2</sup>: 349) acknowledges:

“The special significance of this work for the historian of Greek derives from the fact that the ‘poet’ clearly had little contact with, or interest in, the classicizing tradition of serious Greek literature, and wrote in a style reflecting his natural speech”

Browning (1999<sup>2</sup>: 73) even claims that it is a document of almost pure spoken Greek. Its language seems thus somewhat less “mixed” than the other texts (cf. supra 1.1.1.2.1). Furthermore, it abounds with formulas. Pioneer M. Jeffreys (1973: 188) has found that the level of formulas in the Havniensis manuscript ranges from 21.2 percent to 53.5 percent, which surpasses all other Greek vernacular works (cf. supra 1.1.2.2.1). Shawcross (2009: 181) confirms these oral residues: “Everything about the Greek version suggests that it is a text which has been highly influenced by methods of composition derived from the pragmatic concerns of oral performance and reception” (cf. Eideneier 1999: 106ff.). In terms of subject matter, though, it differs from the romances: this chronicle covers the history of French feudalism on the Peloponnese (old name “Morea”) after the fourth crusade in 1204 and thus presents the only text of my corpus whose basis is not a fictional story.

Interestingly, the renowned Byzantinist E. Jeffreys (2012b) has very recently formulated a hypothesis concerning the genesis of the Palaiologan romances – more precisely: concerning their formal distinguishing features (the use of the “vernacular” and the πολιτικὸς στίχος, as well as the presence of formulas) – in which the *Chronicle of Morea* was granted a key role. E. Jeffreys connects the *Chronicle of Morea* with the romance *War of Troy*, because both originated in the mainland, i.e. the Peloponnese, which was under Frankish government. Indeed, it is almost sure that the *Chronicle of Morea* was written in this region, which should not come as a surprise given its content. With regard to the *War of Troy* too, it has been accepted that its place of composition is the Peloponnese. As for its content, the *War of Troy* is based on Benoît de Sainte Maure’s *Roman de Troie*, which tells the famous story of the siege of Troy and the return of the Greek heroes. The Greek adaptation would then have been due to an ideological

program developed by this Franco-Greekish ruling class in order to justify their presence and domination. While its provenance has been well established, it has never been slotted satisfactorily into a date (E. Jeffreys 2013: 226). E. Jeffreys now believes that the *War of Troy* has been an impetus for the other LMG πολιτικός στίχος romances:

“A copy of the *War of Troy*, the massive text on love and war that had been generated in the Morea, could have come to the capital soon after it was written, and would have been read in literary circles. An interest in amatory material will already have been fuelled by Greek traditions coming as much from the novels of the twelfth century as those of late antiquity” (E. Jeffreys 2013: 231)

Thus, she claims that the arrival of the *War of Troy* in Constantinople must have galvanised the creation of the other Palaiologan romances (E. Jeffreys 2013: 226). If this hypothesis is accepted, this leads to an early date of composition of the *War of Troy*. While older proposals considered the (early) 14<sup>th</sup> century likely<sup>27</sup>, she defends a dating at the end of the 13<sup>th</sup> century.

When the crucial question arises why this adaptation of Benoit St Maure’s *Roman de Troie* has adopted such a peculiar style (the use of the “vernacular” and of the πολιτικός στίχος; its oral-formulaic character), she invokes the *Chronicle of Morea*. As we have just seen, the *Chronicle of Morea* indeed exhibits all the formal characteristics of the romances. According to her, (an early – oral? – version of) this chronicle then served as the model of the *War of Troy* as well as of the later πολιτικός στίχος romances:

“The suggestion, then, is that when Leonardo de Veroli [the hypothesised customer of the *War of Troy*] wanted to have the vernacular French *Roman de Troie* put into a register of Greek that would be accessible to the Greeks of Morea as well as to the mixed-race communities that had come into existence since 1204, only one register would have been open to him. The only extant lengthy text in easily intelligible Greek would have been an early [[oral?]] version of the *Chronicle of Morea*” (E. Jeffreys 230f.)

Regardless of the credibility of this hypothesis (which does not answer the question why the chronicle *in the first place* makes use of the πολιτικός στίχος and adopts an oral-

---

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Beaton (1989: 134); Papathomopoulos & E. Jeffreys (1996: lxxxix); Failler (1997: 346); Marboeuf (2009); Shawcross (2009).

formulaic style<sup>28</sup>), it must have become clear that the *Chronicle of Morea* constitutes a landmark and is thus rightly included in my corpus (despite its rather “unromantic” character), for it marks “the beginning of a new era in medieval Greek literature” (Anaxagorou 1998: 117).<sup>29</sup>

### 3.3.2 Selection of versions and editions

As signalled, the manuscript tradition of the so-called vernacular literature poses some serious challenges for editors: many of the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poems have been preserved in more than one version (cf. supra 1.1.2.2.2). In what follows, I will account for my selection of the versions and of the editions.

The editions can, since recently, all be integrally found on the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* website, the comprehensive database of Ancient and Medieval Greek texts, which greatly facilitates queries. However, since the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* does not include the critical apparatus of the editions, we cannot solely rely on it. Rather, we should check the printed editions or – preferably – the manuscripts (cf. supra 1.1.2.2.2). For a detailed description of the manuscripts, I refer to the respective editions.<sup>30</sup>

#### 3.3.2.1 One single manuscript

*Velthandros & Chrysandza* (Bibliothèque Nationale Parisinus Graecus 2909 ff. 1r-40v; 1350 verses) and the *Ilias Byzantina* (Bibliothèque Nationale Parisinus suppl. Graecus 926; 1166 verses) are preserved in one single manuscript and accordingly pose few problems. I rely on the most recent edition: Egea (1998) in case of the former and Nørgaard & Smith (1975) in case of the latter.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Here, we could perhaps refer back to the fact that the first writers exploiting the vernacular for literary purposes had no models except oral ones; cf. supra 1.1.2.4.2.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Marboeuf (2009: 8).

<sup>30</sup> Moreover, Chatzegiakoumes (1977: 17-27) has written a survey on the manuscripts and editions of *Livistros & Rodamni*, *Velthandros & Chrysandza* (and *Kallimachos & Chrysorroi*).

<sup>31</sup> Egea (1998) has also translated *Velthandros & Chrysandza* into Spanish. Lavagnini (1988) does the same for the *Ilias Byzantina*.

### 3.3.2.2 More than one manuscript

On the other hand, the *Achilleïs Byzantina*, the *War of Troy*, *Imberios & Margarona*, *Livistros & Rodamni*, *Phlorios & Platzia Phlora* and the *Chronicle of Morea* survive in parallel versions. Here, the question arises which manuscript(s) and which edition I should use.

#### *Chronicle of Morea (9219 verses)*

With respect to the *Chronicle of Morea*, the answer is straightforward: it is generally established that the Copenhagen manuscript or Havniensis 57 (H) manuscript is “la plus ancienne, la plus complète et la plus authentique” (Marboeuf 2009: 14) of the five manuscripts in which the Greek version of the chronicle has been handed down to us (Lurier 1964; Shawcross 2009). Therefore, M. Jeffreys (1973: 194) speaks of a “clear codex optimus”.<sup>32</sup> By choosing H as basic manuscript, I follow Egea (1988), who has written a grammar of the chronicle and mainly uses examples from H (if not: it is indicated which manuscript he does use), as well as Lurier (1964), who has based his English translation on H.

I have relied on the edition of Schmitt (1904), which is “old but nevertheless reliable” (Aerts 2005: 142). The beginning, which is missing in H, and other lacunas in H are supplemented by manuscript Taurinensis B II I. Schmitt has undertaken an enormous task, for his edition also contains the Parisinus Graecus 2898 (P) manuscript, the other important manuscript in which the chronicle has been handed down to us (8191 verses). He has presented H and P in parallel. As such, the chronicle provides us with a unique situation, which enable us to conduct comparative case studies (cf. infra 4.2.3). I am not the first one to see this advantage:

“L’édition de Schmitt présente l’avantage considérable de fournir en parallèle les versions principales H et P et en apparat critique les variantes de T. C’est pourquoi les éditeurs, commentateurs et traducteurs suivants, comme Kalonaros et J. M. Egea, ont fondé leurs recherches sur ce travail” (Marboeuf 2009: 14)

Such a parallel edition has been possible, since both manuscripts more or less tell the same story. Nevertheless, there are some important ideological and linguistic differences. H is the older of the two, written in the late 14<sup>th</sup> century. H seems to reflect a somewhat anti-Greek attitude (M. Jeffreys 1975b: 305f.; Shawcross 2009: 263). P, copied much later, filters out the pro-Frankish passages “found distasteful” or rewrites them

---

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Lurier (1964: 33); Beck (1971 : 159); E. & M. Jeffreys (1986: 521).

from a more Greek perspective (Shawcross 2009: 264). With regard to the exact relationship between H and P, M. Jeffreys (1975b: 350) is convinced that P is probably not directly or indirectly copied from H. As a result of its pro-Frankish feelings and its “badly written Greek”<sup>33</sup>, Schmitt (1904: xxxviii) claims that H is written by a non-native speaker (Schmitt 1904: xxixf.).<sup>34</sup> On the other hand, M. Jeffreys presumes that both H and P are written by native Greeks.

#### *The War of Troy (14,401 verses)*

The *War of Troy* has been preserved in no fewer than seven manuscripts (Papathomopoulos & E. Jeffreys 1996: xciii-civ), which can be interpreted a sign of its popularity:

“Despite its prodigious length [14,401 verses!], it seems to have been the most read and copied of all the vernacular romances, if the number of surviving manuscripts (seven) can be taken as a reliable guide” (Beaton 1996<sup>2</sup>: 136)

Not surprisingly, thus far only one edition has been published: the edition of Papathomopoulos & E. Jeffreys (1996). Papathomopoulos & E. Jeffreys thought it best to combine all manuscripts using a Lachmannian stemma.<sup>35</sup>

#### *Livistros & Rodamni (4013 verses)*

With regard to *Livistros & Rodamni*, which has been attested in five manuscripts, Agapitos (2006a) has combined manuscripts according to his understanding of the author’s language, which has resulted in text “α” (cf. E. Jeffreys 2008 review).<sup>36</sup> However, I have given preference to the edition (princeps!<sup>37</sup>) of Lendari (2007), who presents a single manuscript, i.e. the Vatican one (Vaticanus Graecus 2391 ff. 1r-152v), which is our fullest witness (Beaton 1996<sup>2</sup>: 106; cf. Manoussages 1952: 75).

---

<sup>33</sup> Aerts (1990) alludes to this point of view in the title of his survey article: “Was the Author of the Chronicle of Morea that Bad?”.

<sup>34</sup> More specifically: by a Graecised Frank or a so-called Gasmule, the offspring of a Graeco-Frankish marriage (Schmitt 1904: xxxviii).

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Papathomopoulos’ (1987) article “L’édition critique du ΠΟΛΕΜΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΤΡΩΑΔΟΣ: Problèmes méthodologiques”.

<sup>36</sup> The five manuscripts are: Parisinus Graecus 2910; Neapolitanus III Aa 9; Escorial Ψ IV 22; Leiden Scaliger 55 and Vaticanus Graecus 2391 (cf. Manoussages 1952: 74f.).

<sup>37</sup> Ten years ago, Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>: 106) wrote: “our fullest witness is a manuscript of the Vatican (Cod. Vat. gr. 2391) (...) unfortunately remains unpublished”.

*Achilleïs Byzantina* (1926 verses)

I have treated the *Achilleïs Byzantina* in a similar way: I have chosen to concentrate on the Naples version (Neapolitanus Graecus III B 27 ff. 13-60), edited by Agapitos, Hult & Smith (1999), because it is held to be the most complete manuscript (Agapitos 2006b: 158).<sup>38</sup>

*Phlorios & Platzia Phlora* (1867 verses)

With regard to *Phlorios & Platzia Phlora* too, I have adopted this line of reasoning. Two manuscripts survive containing the story of *Phlorios & Platzia Phlora* (Londinensis add. 8241 & Vindobonensis Theologicus Graecus 244; cf. Beaton 1996<sup>2</sup>: 137). The most recent edition is the one by Salas (1998a), who bases his edition after a profound manuscript study on the Viennese version, which seems our most complete one.<sup>39</sup>

*Imberios & Margarona* (893 verses)

Finally, with regard to *Imberios & Margarona*, the same principle has been applied once more. I have relied on the manuscript that contains the fullest version of the story, i.e. the Naples manuscript (Neapolitanus Graecus III B 27, which also contains the *Achilleïs Byzantina*). This seems to be Kriaras' (1955) base manuscript:<sup>40</sup> "It is preserved in whole

---

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Smith (1987: 316); Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>: 104).

The other manuscripts are the British Museum add. 8241 and the Oxoniensis Bodleianus Auct. T.5.24. The latter, which is twice as short as the Naples version (M. Jeffreys 1975a: 189), possibly reflects a real oral performance (Agapitos 2006b: 162; Smith 1987: 321ff.; cf. supra 1.1.2.5.1.1).

<sup>39</sup> Cf. separate article by Salas (1998b) on the mistakes made in previous editions: especially the edition of *Phlorios & Platzia Phlora* by Kriaras (1955) is severely criticised. Salas' (1998a: 68) principle reads as follows: "Con nuestra edición pretendemos aunar, por tanto, los aciertos de las anteriores pero bajo criterios filológicamente conservadores, manteniendo en la medida de lo posible el texto transmitido por los manuscritos y otorgándole mayor protagonismo al vienés, el más susceptible de mejora después de haber sido maltratado por el pruritus emendandi de los editores que nos precedieron".

<sup>40</sup> This is suggested by the following scheme:

1-35: NOV

36-414: NOVH

415-745: NOVHG

746-824: NOVG

825-860: NOV

861-893: NV

with O standing for the Bodleianus miscellaneous 287; V for the Vindobonensis theologicus Graecus 297; and G and H for the Palatinus Graecus 426 (G: 65r-72v; H: 73r-93v) (Kriaras 1955: 23f.; cf. E. & M. Jeffreys 1971: 125f.).

or in part in five manuscripts, of which the earliest is the Naples manuscript that also contains the fullest version of the *Tale of Achilles*” (Beaton 1996<sup>2</sup>: 140).<sup>41</sup>

In conclusion, these eight texts constitute a representative as well as a manageable corpus of LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry, totalling about 35,000 πολιτικοὶ στίχοι.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> Tachibana (1994: 432; fn 2), for instance, also relies on the edition by Kriaras for her linguistic analysis of the spatial expressions in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry.

<sup>42</sup> 34,835 verses to be precise.



## Chapter 4    The πολιτικός στίχος: a natural and flexible metre

*“the political verse is a metre of the ear and not of the eye” (Papathomopoulos & E. Jeffreys 1996: lxxxvii)*

Before applying to my corpus the three concepts crucial within the framework of IS, I will devote a chapter to the metre around which this dissertation revolves: the πολιτικός στίχος. More concretely, I will show that it is a very natural and flexible metre. For this purpose, I will first demonstrate the naturalness of its rhythm, mainly by relying on previous research (4.1). Afterwards, I will present the results of two extensive case studies of my own; both studies testify to the flexibility of the metre under scrutiny (4.2).

I consider this necessary, for I would like to revalue the prejudice apparently shared by a number of scholars that the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry is unsuitable for any kind of linguistic research, because the metrical constraints of the πολιτικός στίχος would impose a straitjacket on the language. Indeed, Byzantinists have shown some reluctance to include the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry in their linguistic analyses, on the assumption that the metrical pattern of the πολιτικός στίχος must have distorted the language. As a matter of fact, this should not come as a surprise, for the validity of metrical texts for linguistic purposes has in general been questioned. Prose texts are considered the only (reliable) witnesses to the naturally spoken language. In the case of the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry, the situation is not different, as Joseph (2000: 312) too has observed:

“One strategy has been to accord greater weight to the evidence of prose texts over poetic ones for showing “real” features of the spoken language, the assumption being that part of the poetic process involves stretching grammatical and lexical boundaries”

The conviction that the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry is inappropriate for any kind of linguistic research is usually implicitly present; by the following scholars, however, it is made more explicit:

“Unfortunately, he [Pappas 2004] only uses mainly poetic works due to difficulties in finding prose texts of the period he examines (12<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup>), admittedly a problem if one wants to say something about the language of the period” (Thoma 2007: 140ff.)

“I have chosen to study prose texts in order to avoid the question whether considerations of metre may have influenced the choices made by authors and copyists” (Vejleskov 2005: 198)

Another statement which testifies to the reluctance of linguists to take LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry into consideration is given by Chila-Markopoulou in a review of Pappas (2004):

“Another point (...) concerns the extent to which the corpus is as wide and as representative as possible, since it is restricted to vernacular texts of LMG written in verse. As a consequence, the reliability of the statistical results is compromised” (Chila-Markopoulou 2004: 201)

Chila-Markopoulou, however, admits that the inclusion of LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry is “the usual practice for compiling the corpus for this period”, vernacular prose being extremely scarce from the 12<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup> centuries (cf. supra 1.1.1).<sup>1</sup> The idea that the language of the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry is distorted due to metrical pressure has most strikingly been expressed by Eideneier (1983b: 236): “Die poetische Syntax geht vor der grammatischen Syntax”.

In this chapter, I will show that this view should – to a certain extent – be weakened. This has already been signalled by a number of scholars. Mackridge (1993: 339), for instance, states:

“I believe that, each time grammar appears to be in conflict with versification, we must apply the principle that grammar takes precedence: most scribes knew their language far better than they knew the rules of versification (...) Language is a system, while meter is only a sub-system of it”

---

<sup>1</sup> As a matter of fact, I think that we should just relate the remarkable scarcity of “normal” prose texts to the naturalness of the πολιτικὸς στίχος as a medium for the vernacular idiom; cf. infra 4.1.4.

Albeit somewhat less strongly, Pappas (2004: 74) expresses a similar view:

“One should allow for the possibility that infrequent occurrences of less-than-grammatical constructions would be accepted if they were experienced within a robustly grammatical context, while a succession of them would indeed prohibit comprehension”

In what follows, I will corroborate the view that the πολιτικὸς στίχος does not constitute a metrical straitjacket on the language, but entails a very natural rhythm allowing for much flexibility.

## 4.1 Natural rhythm

### 4.1.1 Metrical elasticity

To begin with, the πολιτικὸς στίχος does not impose many metrical constraints and is thus not at all constitute a rigid metrical system:

“Weiters is darauf hinzuweisen, dass der metrische Druck in volkssprachlichen Werken im Fünfzehnsilber nicht so gross war, dass er Sprache in ihrer Struktur umgestalten hätte können” (Hinterberger 1993: 165)

Indeed, the πολιτικὸς στίχος allows a lot of what can be called “metrical elasticity”: “Es lässt sich nur ein Minimum an Regeln für diesen Vers aufstellen” (Beck 1988: 15; cf. Politis 2010: 148). Let me go through these rules.

#### 4.1.1.1 The (few) rules and how they can be stretched

The most compelling requirement is its length: each verse must contain fifteen syllables (hence “dekapentasyllabos”, “δεκαπεντασύλλαβος” or “Fünfzehnsilber” or simply “15syllaber”) (Lauxtermann 1999). Nonetheless, even here we sometimes encounter deviations:

“Die Dichter hatten oder nahmen sich die Möglichkeit, die “poetische Freiheit”, (...) den normalen Fünfzehnsilber um zwei Silben zu erweitern bei Wahrung der normalen Verteilung der akzenttragenden Silben” (Kambylis 1995: 66f.; cf. Agapitos 2006a: 245)

*Hypermetrical* (more than 15 syllables) verses seem to be more acceptable than *hypometrical* (fewer than 15 syllables) ones. Therefore, Nørgaard & Smith (1975: 16), for instance, have only emended the hypometrical verses in their edition of the *Ilias Byzantina*.

These fifteen syllables are divided into two standard half-verses by a fixed break or caesura after the eighth syllable (from now on marked with the sign #). In principle, only the even syllables are stressed (which results in a iambic pattern; cf. *infra* 4.1.3), as well the first and the ninth syllable of each half-verse (cf. *infra* 5.1.2). However, not every even syllable must of course be stressed: there is a wide variety of rhythmical variation of stress on the even syllables, so that it leaves the poet enough room to avoid monotony (Lendari 2007: 128).<sup>2</sup>

Moreover, as in ancient metres, elision and hiatus are very frequently used strategies to fit the metrical requirements.<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, we cannot automatically consider all half-verses that contain more syllables than the required number of eight or seven syllables metrically incorrect. The following contrastive pair (taken from the parallel manuscripts of the *Chronicle of Morea*) is very suitable for illustrating elision (i.e. the ejection of a vowel when a word ends with a vowel and the next one also begins with one) and its “counterpart” hiatus (i.e. the absence of this vowel omission: the two vowels are fully pronounced):<sup>4</sup>

- (1) τὸ ὅσον ποιήσῃ νὰ στερχτοῦν, # νὰ τὸ ἔχουσιν πληρώνει. (CoM H 318)

Lurier (1964: 76): “[made him a promise] to ratify and fulfil whatever he might effect”

cf. τὸ ὅτι ποιήσῃ νὰ στερχτοῦν # καὶ νὰ τὸ ἐκπληρώσουν. (CoM P 318)

At first sight – or better: count –, the second half-verse of H contains eight syllables. However, if we assume that an elision takes place between τό and ἔχουσιν, this half-verse satisfies the required number of seven syllables. In P, on the other hand, a hiatus must occur between τό and ἐκπληρώσουν in order to “save” the number of seven syllables.

---

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Bakker & van Gemert (1972: 99); Apostolopoulos (1984: 222).

<sup>3</sup> At the caesura, however, elision is avoided; cf. *infra* 5.1.2.

<sup>4</sup> Note that in Modern Greek these terms are used in a different way: we speak of elision when the omission is reflected in the typeface and thus written, while hiatus refers to a non-written omission. Furthermore, this omission is not restricted to vowels across word boundaries, but can also take place within words.

Synizesis (i.e. two originally syllabic vowels are pronounced as a single syllable) of *i* and *e* with a following vowel is another common strategy to maintain the required number of syllables (Lendari 2007: 130)<sup>5</sup>; again, a parallel pair is clarifying:

- (2) ἄς ἔχω εἶδῃσιν μικρὴν # κ' εὐθέως νὰ τοῦ ἀποστείλω. (CoM H 6550)

Lurier (1964: 259): “let me have a short notice, and I shall send them to him at once”

cf. ἄς ἔχω εἶδῃσιν μικρὴν # εὐθέως νὰ τὰ στείλω. (CoM P 6550)

In P the adverb εὐθέως contains three separate syllables, while in H the *ε* and *ω* must be pronounced as one simple syllable.<sup>6</sup>

Moreover, these metrical phenomena are not only important for achieving the correct number of syllables, but also to get the *right* (i.e. even) syllable stressed, for instance:

- (3) τοῦ κόσμου ὅλου οἱ ἅπαντες # ἐκατηγόρησάν τον (CoM H 83)

Lurier (1964: 69): “all the men of the world censured him”

The first half-verse consists of nine syllables, so elision must take place *once*. There are three possible places where it can occur: between κόσμου and ὅλου, between ὅλου and οἱ and between οἱ and ἅπαντες. We can assume an elision between either ὅλου and οἱ or οἱ and ἅπαντες, while a hiatus must occur between κόσμου and ὅλου because of the stress pattern: if elision took place between κόσμου and ὅλου, the third syllable would be stressed instead of the fourth.

In the next verse, synizesis takes place in ἀπολογίαν to get the eighth syllable stressed. In Μορέαν, on the other hand, synizesis does not occur, as the fourteenth syllable needs to carry the stress:<sup>7</sup>

- (4) κ' ἐζήτησέ του ἀπολογίαν # ν' ἀπέλθῃ στὸν Μορέαν (CoM H 6495)

Lurier (1964: 257): “and asked his leave to go to Morea”

Besides, it must be admitted that a stressed odd syllable is not that unusual:

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Apostolopoulos (1984: 14); Browning (1999<sup>2</sup>: 77); Hinterberger (2006: 8).

<sup>6</sup> Note that elision takes place between τοῦ and ἀποστείλω in H.

<sup>7</sup> That Μορέαν is a good candidate for synizesis is shown by the following verse:

- (1) ἐκεῖσε γὰρ εἰς τὸν Μορέαν # στὸν πρίγκιπα Γυλιάμον (CoM H 3482)

“there in Morea, with the prince Guillaume”

Here, synizesis takes place in order to get the eighth syllable stressed. Between brackets: note that in Γυλιάμον synizesis is accompanied by a shift of the accent; cf. *infra* 4.1.1.2.

“the metre always allowed considerable flexibility in the position of stress-accent (...) no hard-and-fast rules can be laid down” (Alexiou & Holton 1976: 23; cf. Condoravdi & Kiparsky 2004: 175)

M. Jeffreys (1974: 148; fn 11) is more concrete:

“The only invariable rules are the stress-accents on 14 and either on 6 or 8. There are no stresses on 7, 13 and 15, except occasionally on unimportant words (articles, pronouns, prepositions, etc.) at 7 and 13”

Indeed, as the above statement by M. Jeffreys points to, a special category is formed by the “unimportant words” or “mots accessoires” (Apostolopoulos 1984: 37), which include conjunctions, prepositions, definite articles, particles, object clitic pronouns (OCPs) and some demonstratives (Apostolopoulos 1984: 37). These words are irrelevant with regard to the stress pattern and accordingly should not be taken into account: “l’accent des mots ‘synnomes’ n’ayant aucune valeur métrique” (Apostolopoulos 1984: 213). Interestingly, this can tell us something about the status of a certain word. We will see that the syllabic position of *πάλιν*, which is traditionally analysed as an adverb, reinforces our thesis that it often functions as mere particle – as a DM, to use the modern linguistic terminology – in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry (cf. *infra* 5.3.3.2). Especially with regard to the ancient particles such as *γάρ*, *γοῦν*, *δ(έ)*, *μέν* and *οὔν*, it has been sufficiently observed that their written accent is of an artificial, merely conventional nature (cf. Wackernagel 1892: 377).<sup>8</sup> Noret (1995 & 1998) has repeatedly shown that these particles often lack an accent in Byzantine manuscripts (cf. Hörander 1981: 34).<sup>9</sup> With regard to OCPs, it is the convention to accentuate them only when they stand before the verb. As such, the written accent on the third syllable in the following example does not play a role with regard to the actual stress pattern, since the accent on the OCP *τούς* is conventional:

- (5) Ὁ δούξ τούς ἀποδέχθηκεν # μετὰ χαρᾶς μεγάλης (PP 306)  
“the leader welcomed them with great joy”

The artificiality of the accent is confirmed by the fact that OCPs do not receive an accent if they appear postverbally.

---

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Noret & De Vocht (1985-86); cf. *infra* 4.2.1.1.

<sup>9</sup> Laum (1928) had observed the same with regard to the papyri.

#### 4.1.1.2 Spelling vs. real pronunciation

This all points to the general problem of the discrepancy between theory and practice: to what extent do the spelling conventions in the manuscripts reflect the real pronunciation? The case is that the scribes aim at the ancient spelling conventions, which do no longer correspond to the spoken language of the time:

“Perhaps the most striking feature here is the mismatch between the colloquial pronunciation required to meet the demands of the metre (...) and the conservative orthography which, if taken seriously, would produce many immetrical lines” (Horrocks 2010<sup>2</sup>: 353)

We can thus expect that a number of metrical irregularities can simply be explained as divergences between the written text and the spoken word (Moennig 2004: 157).<sup>10</sup> A nice example is the ancient preposition εἰς: if followed by the definite article in Modern Greek (which normally uses the prepositional form σε), it contracts to στόν/στήν/στό/etc. (Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warbuton 2004: 25). However, in the manuscripts of the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry we sometimes still find the full form εἰς, although this results in (graphically) hypermetrical verses:

- (6) ὥς ὑπερβαίνουν ἄνωθεν # οἱ κορυφές εἰς τὸν τοῖχον (AB 771)  
“so that the tops [of the trees] go beyond the wall”

Hence, we can assume that the actual pronunciation was στόν.

Another well-known example reflecting the discrepancy between spelling and pronunciation concerns the above outlined phenomenon of synizesis. In Modern Greek, synizesis is usually indicated by a shift of the accent, so we would have expected ἀπολογιάν instead of ἀπολογία in example CoM H 6495 (cf. Browning 1999<sup>2</sup>: 77). However, the scribes maintain the ancient notation, as is well-documented:

“in many, even rather late manuscripts of vernacular texts the accent is placed on the first of two consecutive vowels, while we know that in the spoken language they had been synizesised long before (e.g. Συρία-Συριά, καρδιά-καρδιά)” (Hinterberger 2006: 8; cf. Lendari 2007: 130; fn 5)

Finally, it is interesting to note that metrical irregularities have been related to oral performance (cf. supra 1.1.2.5.1.1): it is very plausible that a number of verses judged

---

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Hinterberger (2006: 8): “I would suggest that in many cases it is a pure orthographical convention that determines the form regardless of pronunciation”.

incorrect according to the rules we derive today were made to sound metrically perfect in an oral performance. According to Moennig (2004: 212), such metrical irregularities could easily be smoothed out when performing aloud. Marboeuf (2009: 55) even considers the fact that so many metrical “mistakes” vanish when spoken aloud as confirmation of an oral performance:

“seule la diction, grâce à des aphérèses, des apocopes ou des crases faciles à réaliser oralement, peut rétablir une juste métrique, ce qui confirme par ailleurs la primauté de la transmission orale”

In sum, we – and especially those among us who have editorial ambitions – may not conclude too easily that a verse is metrically incorrect.

#### 4.1.2 Truly spoken word accent

The naturalness of the metre under scrutiny is indirectly also confirmed by the attitude of learned contemporaries towards it. Initially, learned Byzantines, such as Planudes (13<sup>th</sup> c.) for instance, seem to despise the πολιτικὸς στίχος or at least do not accord any literary merit to it (cf. E. Jeffreys 2013: 219).<sup>11</sup> Tzetzes (12<sup>th</sup> c.) too repudiates the πολιτικὸς στίχος as a “barbarous monstrosity” (Lauxtermann 1998: 13; fn 13; cf. Henrichsen 1839: 32ff.). These savants condemn the metre as “la fase estrema di un processo di degenerazione, fase talmente degradata che e meglio non parlare nemmeno” (Peri 2012: 145). If they nevertheless use the metre, they feel uncomfortable and seek excuses (Beck 1988: 15).<sup>12</sup> The reason for such an attitude is that the πολιτικὸς στίχος is very well suited for the “ordinary” everyday language and thus had become particularly associated with the spoken form of the language (M. Jeffreys 1974).<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> For Planudes’ contempt, see *Περὶ γραμματικῆς διάλογος* 98, 25-29; cf. Shawcross (2009: 169); Symeonides (1981: 237f.).

<sup>12</sup> Tzetzes, for instance, forestalls possible attacks by blaming his patronesses, who must have demanded it (cf. M. Jeffreys 1975a: 178).

<sup>13</sup> However, the πολιτικὸς στίχος is not always connected to a vernacular origin. To this day, scholars have not reached a consensus as to whether it has popular roots (M. Jeffreys & Horrocks - the predominant view) or learned ones (Politis & Koder - the view of Greeks in particular); cf. Alexiou & Holton (1976) for an overview of the literature in this topic. Moreover, it has been noted that the metre has known different stress preferences during its evolution. Papathomopoulos & E. Jeffreys (1996: lxxxvii), for instance, state that in its early stage (before the 10<sup>th</sup> century) a stress on the 6<sup>th</sup> syllable was preferred to one on the 8<sup>th</sup>. However, issues of origin are irrelevant for my purpose (cf. Peri 2012: 144; fn 107 for more references).



Indeed, contrary to ancient metres – which are still used by Byzantine scholars such as Planudes and Tzetzes –, the πολιτικὸς στίχος is not based on the since long disappeared distinction between long and short syllables, but actually takes the actually pronounced stress into consideration. The fact that the πολιτικὸς στίχος is not a prosodic metre has led to its exclusion from Byzantine metrical treatises, for in Byzantine eyes “metric” is equivalent to “prosodic” (Lauxtermann 1998: 13). Consider, for instance, the first of the *Prodromic poems* (1.9), in which the πολιτικὸς στίχος is called “ἄμετρος”: “εἰ μὴ τινὰς πολιτικοὺς ἄμετροὺς πάλιν στίχους”. Whereas the prosodic system is completely artificial in this period, the accentual principle is grounded on the spoken everyday language (Maas 1903: 280).<sup>14</sup>

### 4.1.3 Suitable iambic pattern

What is more, the stress pattern of the πολιτικὸς στίχος entails a rhythm which is very suitable for the (spoken) Greek language. It must have been extremely suitable, for the πολιτικὸς στίχος verses have been awarded the designation “ἡμαξευμένοι στίχοι” (“running-like-a-chariot-on-a-paved-road verses”). Beck (1988: 15) even labels it “der geborene Vers für eine einfache, volkstümliche Aussage” (cf. Rosenqvist 2007: 113). This perceived naturalness of the πολιτικὸς στίχος is the result of its iambic rhythm (stress on the even syllables), which is acknowledged to be very natural for the Greek language. Mackridge (1990b: 204; fn 9), for instance, speaks of “the natural two-beat rhythm of Modern Greek” and relates the iambic pattern to the synenclisis rule, e.g. ἄνθρωπός τις. This is confirmed by Stavrou (1992: 66), who observes that: “Ο ἱαμβικὸς δεκαπεντασύλλαβος εἶναι (...) ὁ πιὸ συνηθισμένος στίχος στὴ γλώσσα μας”.

Illustratively, the πολιτικὸς στίχος is still the usual metre of Modern Greek folk songs (Baud-Bovy 1973; cf. supra 1.1.2.4.2). As a consequence, the πολιτικὸς στίχος has been the dominant metre for Greek poetry from the 12<sup>th</sup> until the 20<sup>th</sup> (!) century (M. Jeffreys 1974).<sup>15</sup> Hence, the πολιτικὸς στίχος has been dubbed the “National Metre of Modern Greece” or “εθνικὸς στίχος” (e.g. Papathomopoulos & E. Jeffreys 1996: lxxxvii).

---

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Henrichsen (1839: 9 & 72).

<sup>15</sup> Cf. M. Jeffreys (1987: 146; fn 12) even makes the following hypothesis: “Υπολογίζω ὅτι τουλάχιστον 95% ἀπὸ τοὺς στίχους γραμμένους στὸ ἐπίπεδο τοῦ Volksliteratur πρὶν ἀπὸ τὴν ἄλωση [of Constantinople, 1453] εἶναι σε δεκαπεντασύλλαβο”.

#### 4.1.4 Rarity of vernacular prose

As repeatedly emphasised, with regard to LMG so-called vernacular literature, the πολιτικός στίχος even dominates over prose. This is a final – admittedly more tentative – argument why we can assume that the πολιτικός στίχος is anything but a complex metre. In this context, it is relevant to mention another synonym of “πολιτικός στίχος”, namely “πεζός στίχος”. The term “πεζός” is said to point to the fluent, almost prosaic nature of the metre (Hinterberger 1993: 165).<sup>16</sup> Symeonides (1982: 229) confirms that the πολιτικός στίχος was considered a “prosaic verse” on the basis of a scholion (“μεσονύκτιον ἰ ποιητικόν, οὐ πολιτικόν”).<sup>17</sup>

The competition with prose can presumably be interpreted more literally: it is striking that vernacular literary works in prose are so rare in the 12<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup> centuries, while the πολιτικός στίχος enjoys such an enormous popularity: “There is virtually no prose literature in vernacular Greek of the Byzantine period” (Browning 1999<sup>2</sup>: 270). Indeed, in the period under investigation prose and other metrical patterns are both equally rare (E. & M. Jeffreys 1986: 510).

Rather than conceiving the lack of prose as a methodological problem which paralyses any kind of linguistic research, I consider it an extra argument in favour of the naturalness of the πολιτικός στίχος. It is, for instance, telling that of all the languages (Greek, Italian, Aragonese, French) in which the *Chronicle of Morea* has been handed down, the Greek version is the only one which is not written in prose (cf. Marboeuf 2009: 21; cf. supra 3.3.1.2). In my view, this actually points to the natural character of the πολιτικός στίχος. Presumably, the name “πολιτικός στίχος” is even derived from this character:

“weit wahrscheinlicher ist es dagegen, was auch die Meisten annehmen, dass das Wort [πολιτικός] bürgerlich, allgemein, zum täglichen Leben gehörig, populär bedeutet, in Gegensatz gegen das Kunstmässige, Poetische, und dass also solche accentuirte Verse” (Henrichsen 1839: 44)<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> In the dictionary of Kriaras, we find απλός (“simple”) and κατανοητός (“comprehensible”) under the lemma πεζός.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Symeonides (1981: 239); Cupane (1995: 17); Marboeuf (2009: 46).

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Beck (1988: 15): “gängig, alltäglich, trivial”; Horrocks (2010<sup>2</sup>: 368 fn 1): “public/common”. However, the term “πολιτικός στίχος” – that is to say: the adjective “πολιτικός” – is disputed. The more straightforward explanation, namely that it means “urban”, i.e. “Constantinopolitan”, has also been suggested, but been

We can conclude this subsection on the natural rhythm of the πολιτικὸς στίχος by saying that this metre does not at all impose a metrical straitjacket on the language, but is, on the contrary, a very natural metre for the Greeks to compose in. I could not have summarised it better than the anonymous Wikipedia contributor ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political\\_verse](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political_verse); last access on 25/11/2014): “it is such a natural meter for the language that one could actually form continually ones’ everyday speech in political verse, if one wished to do so”...

## 4.2 Much flexibility

The view that the πολιτικὸς στίχος does not constitute a metrical straitjacket will be further sustained by my own research. In this second subsection on the metre of the πολιτικὸς στίχος, I will present the results of two extensive case studies which show that the metre under scrutiny allows a great deal of flexibility, yet that this flexibility should not be confused with *arbitrariness*: certain contemporary grammatical rules are consistently obeyed. Both case studies deal with the distribution of clitics, both object personal pronouns (OCPs) and particles, and are thus syntactically oriented. Accordingly, I will begin with giving some background information on the phenomenon of clitics (4.2.1).

In a first case study (4.2.2), I will deal with one of the core syntactic patterns of Standard Modern Greek, namely the “verbal unit” comprising the particle νά, object clitic pronouns and the verb. It will become clear that this obligatory unit had already firmly been established in the “hotchpotch” which the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry has sometimes been claimed to be (cf. *supra* 1.1.1.2.1).

The second case study (4.2.3) concerns the *Chronicle of Morea*, whose two most important manuscripts provide us an ideal test case to observe the flexible character of the metre under investigation: running parallel, H and P give a clear picture of the many rephrasing possibilities which the πολιτικὸς στίχος allows (while the contemporary rules for OCPs are respected, though).

---

refuted on the basis of the accentuation (Peri 2012: 146; fn 116). What is certain, is that its name is *unrelated* to the concept of politics. For an overview of the different interpretations, see Symeonides (1981).

## 4.2.1 Background information on clitics

### 4.2.1.1 Terminology and typology

Clitics are small words which are inherently unstressed and consequently have to lean – “κλίνω” in Ancient Greek – on another word: a phonological “host” (Zwicky 1977: 9).<sup>19</sup> If this phonological host is the following word, we speak of a *proclitic*; if it selects a preceding word as phonological host, it is an *enclitic*. It is important to note that the syntactic host does not need to be the same as the phonological host.

The most studied *Greek* clitics are the particles and the OCPs. The large class of Greek clitics further also includes unstressed possessive pronouns, indefinite pronouns, the definite article and a few verbs (cf. Jannaris 1897: 73f.). With particles, I refer both to enclitic particles written without an accent, such as τε and γε, and particles which traditionally receive an accent, such as δέ, γάρ, μέν and οὖν (remember that this accent is a mere orthographic convention in the Byzantine manuscripts; cf. supra 4.1.1.1). The OCPs, whose grammatical function is to mark the (in)direct object and whose syntactic host is thus the verb, have also been termed “weak” pronouns (Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warbuton 2004: 87), since they constitute the “counterpart” of the *strong* personal pronouns.<sup>20</sup> Although “clitic” is a charged term and its status has been disputed with regard to (later) Greek, I maintain the wide-spread term “clitic” for the sake of consistency (cf. infra 5.2.3 on “clitic doubling”).<sup>21</sup>

### 4.2.1.2 Diachronic sketch

It is, of course, especially the rules for the distribution of OCPs in LMG which will play a major part in the two case studies below. However, these LMG OCP distributional rules cannot be understood without briefly situating them within their diachronic development in Greek, for they are the – rather complex – result of a history of different mechanisms and competing motivations, as Janse (2000: 245) warns: “The evolution of the Greek (...) clitic pronouns thus provides us a very intricate picture of variation, fixing of discourse strategies, grammaticalization and reanalysis”. We can already give

---

<sup>19</sup> For references on the general status of clitics, see Anderson’s (2005) monograph.

<sup>20</sup> Remember that the strong personal pronouns have many variant forms in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry (e.g. ἐμέ, ἐμένα and ἐμέναν); cf supra 1.1.1.2.2.

<sup>21</sup> Pappas (2004) makes a plea that the LMG OCPs, just like the Modern Greek ones according to some linguists (Joseph 1989), are actually (atypical) affixes (cf. book title: “Variation and Morphosyntactic Change in Greek: From Clitics to Affixes”). Janse (1998c) argues that they constitute a category *sui generis*.

away that the history of the Greek OCPs is one of growing convergence between the two hosts of clitics, i.e. the phonological and the syntactic one, and can thus be read as a steady process towards grammaticalisation. As for the diachronic evolution of the clitic particles, which ultimately die out, more is to be found in 5.3.1.

#### 4.2.1.2.1 Homeric Greek

Let me – perhaps surprisingly – begin this diachronic sketch of the Greek OCPs in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, with the Swiss philologist Jacob Wackernagel. Wackernagel (1892) has discovered that, in Indo-European, there was a strong tendency for *enclitics* to stand in second position (P2) in the sentence/clause. This also holds for the Greek OCPs, which are enclitic in origin, so that we find them in P2 in the oldest attested literary Greek, the Homeric epics. Consider, for instance, the OCP *μοι* in the next example:

κλῦτε φίλοι• θεῖός μοι ἐνύπνιον ἦλθεν ὄνειρος (Il. 2.56)  
 “Hearken, my friends, a Dream from heaven came to me in my sleep”

Note that this P2 tendency also applies to the Greek particles, such as *γάρ* in the next example:

ὃς γάρ δεύτατος ἦλθεν Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων (Od. 1.286)  
 “for he was the last to reach home of the brazen-coated Achaeans”

Hence, these particles have been labelled “peninitial”, “postpositive” or “P2” particles.<sup>22</sup> As for the OCPs, the effects of Wackernagel’s “Law” are quite remarkable since, due to their preference for second position, they are often separated from their syntactic host, the verb. In the above example, for instance, the OCP *μοι* attaches to its phonological host *θεῖος* and not to its syntactic host *ἦλθεν*. Consequently, syntactic and phonological host do not necessarily coincide in this period.

“P2”, however, should not be considered an absolute notion, for example:

Κύκλωψ, εἰρωτᾷς μ’ ὄνομα κλυτόν, αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τοι  
 “Cyclops, thou askest me of my glorious name, and I will tell it thee;  
 ἐξερέω• σὺ δέ μοι δὸς ξείνιον, ὥς περ ὑπέστης. (Od. 9.364-365)  
 “and do thou give me a stranger's gift, even as thou didst promise”

<sup>22</sup> For a definition of P2 particles in Ancient Greek, see Ruijgh (1990), Marshall (1987: 8-13), H. Dik (1995: 31-34), and, more recently, Goldstein (2010).

So-called prepositive words, such as αὐτάρ in the above example, do not count for the determination of P2 (Dover 1960).<sup>23</sup> The same holds for proclitics, such as the definite article.

Moreover, if several enclitics are combined, they cluster together in P2, as is the case with δέ μοι in the above example. It has been observed that the position of a particular clitic within such a clitic cluster is not at all arbitrary: “l’ordre interne (...) est déterminé par une règle assez stricte” (Ruijgh 1990: 217). Especially with regard to Homeric clitic clusters, a detailed hierarchy has been established (Ruijgh 1990; Wills 1993). If an OCP co-occurs with a particle, the latter must precede the former:

αὐτὸς γάρ σφιν δῶκεν ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων (Il. 2.612)

“For of himself had the king of men, Agamemnon, given them [benched ships]”

πῶς γάρ μοι μύθῳ ἐπιτέλλεαι ἡδὲ κελεύεις; (Il. 10.61)

“With what meaning doth thy word thus charge and command me?”

The same order is still canonical in later Greek (Marshall 1987: 8), as the following example illustrates:

ἐγὼ γάρ σοι ὑπὲρ ἐκείνου ἀποκρινοῦμαι (Plato, *Respublica* 590a3)

“for I will answer you in his behalf”

Furthermore, it has been argued that P2 must be interpreted as the attachment of the enclitic to the first word or constituent *within the IU* rather than within a syntactic unit such as the sentence or the clause, although “the two may and in fact often do coincide” (Janse 2008: 173; cf. supra 2.3.3).<sup>24</sup>

#### 4.2.1.2.2 Classical Greek

In Classical Greek, Wackernagel’s Law is still active, as the following two examples testify:

ἵνα μοι μηδεὶς συνειδείη, ἐν ᾧ μοι ὁ πᾶς κίνδυνος ἦν (Antipho, *De caede Herodis* 43.3)

“to ensure that no one was privy to it, for there lay my one great danger”

<sup>23</sup> Other examples of prepositives are prepositions, such as ἐν, ἐκ/ἐξ and εἰς, and the coordinator καί (Dover 1960).

<sup>24</sup> For the “delayed position” of the P2 particles as evidence for IU boundaries, I refer to Fraenkel (1932, 1933 & 1965), Marshall (1987), Ruijgh (1990), Janse (1993b & 2000), and Goldstein (2010).

τοῦτό μοι, ὧ φίλοι, εὖ δοκεῖ ἔχειν (Plato, *Respublica* 2.368a.5)  
“This, my friends, I think, was well said”

On the other hand, there is an increasing number of examples in which the OCP stands after the verb, its syntactic host. This tendency can be considered “natural”, since “the phonological dependence of the enclitic pronouns then coincides with their syntactic dependence” (Janse 2008: 176), for instance:

ὥς μὲν ἀφῆκέ με πάντων (Demosthenes, *Contra Pantaenetum* 37.21.1)  
“that he released me from all claims [I have proved to you]”

This is a truly illuminating example, since the particle μὲν still occupies P2. Indeed, the P2 particles remain obedient to Wackernagel’s Law. These two different principles, though, do not necessarily conflict, since the original and the new system can of course co-occur. This was already apparent in the Homeric example (Od. 9.364-365): εἰρωτᾷς μ: the OCP μ(ε) both occupies P2 and stands after the verb.

#### 4.2.1.2.3 Post-Classical Greek/Koine

In the next example as well, the OCP is obedient to Wackernagel’s Law but at the same time follows the verb, which opens the IU. Again, phonological and syntactic host coincide:

ἦψατό μου τις (Lc. 8.46)  
“Someone did touch me”

With this example from the Gospels, we have reached the post-classical period. The New Testament constitutes a suitable corpus to illustrate the development towards postverbal position: its language is close to the spoken Koine, in which simple sentences consisting of only a verb and an (in)direct object in the form of an OCP were without doubt many. The importance of such “minimal sentences” can hardly be overestimated with regard to this evolution, which must have been “based on statistically frequent patterning” (Horrocks 1990: 41). In sum, postverbal position becomes the unmarked order, yet preverbal OCPs are still present in large numbers, for instance:

Τίς μου ἦψατο; (Mc. 5.31)  
“Who touched me?”

The OCP μου is not phonologically attached to its verb, but encliticises to the immediately preceding word τίς. This attraction of the OCP to the interrogative can be historically explained, for an important consequence of Wackernagel’s Law is that words which prefer to open the utterance and thus stand in P1, are often found in

combination with a following OCP, holding its normal second position (Dover 1960; Janse 2000). These words with a natural preference for P1, which attract OCPs towards P2 in preverbal position, can be divided into three categories: function words, preferential words and ad hoc emphasised constituents.<sup>25</sup>

With function words I refer to words which are syntactically obliged to open a subordinate clause, namely all sorts of subordinators (complementation, condition, time, comparison, finality; e.g. ἵνα μοι). Pronominal relatives (e.g. ἐν ᾧ μοι) are reckoned among the function words as well, since they behave as subordinators. The functioning of function words must be sought on a purely syntactic level: “the one characteristic that these words share and which sets them apart from all other elements associated with preverbal placement is that they only have grammatical meaning” (Pappas 2004: 41). Speakers must have regarded these frequently occurring combinations as “collocations” (Janse 2000). This reanalysis of course thwarts the evolution towards convergence between phonological and syntactic host, as the OCP encliticises to the P1 word, but syntactically belongs to the verb.

The same reanalysis must have been applied to words which often stand at the front of the IU due to emphatic reasons, such as interrogatives (e.g. τίς μου), negations, demonstratives (e.g. τοῦτό μοι), strong personal pronouns (e.g. ἐγὼ γάρ σοι; ἐγὼ τοι; σὺ δέ μοι), as well as distinctive (e.g. μόνος, ἄλλος, ἕτερος) and quantitative adjectives (e.g. πᾶς, πολύς). Dover (1960: 20) calls these words, which are “disproportionally common” at the beginning of an utterance, “preferential words”.

By extension, ad hoc emphasised constituents, which can belong to all word classes, optionally attract OCPs into preverbal position, since “a characteristic position for items of emphasis or contrast in Greek is initial position” (Horrocks 1990: 41).<sup>26</sup> In another example from the Gospels, the noun phrase ὁ κόσμος, which is contrasted with ἐγὼ and thus emphasised, indeed occurs with a preverbal OCP:

καὶ ὁ κόσμος σε οὐκ ἔγνω, # ἐγὼ δέ σε ἔγνω (Jn. 17.25)  
 “the world hasn’t known you, but I knew you”

However, we cannot draw a sharp line between the last two categories, since preferential words are actually “des mots qui sont, pour ainsi dire, emphatiques de

<sup>25</sup> For a discussion of the notion of emphasis, see *infra* 5.2.1.3.1.

<sup>26</sup> This seems to be a cross-linguistic tendency: “the less predictable the information is or the more important, the more likely it is to be placed earlier in the clause (or in whatever relevant unit of structured information)” (Givón 2001: 250).



nature” (Janse 1993a: 94). As a consequence, a continuum might constitute a more suitable way to present these P1 words which are responsible for many instances of preverbal OCPs, yet the threefold classification is maintained here for the sake of clarity.

#### 4.2.1.2.4 Late Medieval Greek

In LMG, the period which interests us, these remnants of Wackernagel’s Law take on a more compelling character: the tendencies for preverbal position detected in post-Classical Greek are now labelled “rules” by Mackridge (1993: 325). We should not forget, however, that postverbal position had become the unmarked order. Consequently, the LMG distribution seems to be a logical continuation of the post-classical period, yet at the same time it constitutes the steppingstone to the modern distribution of Greek OCPs.<sup>27</sup>

It is Peter Mackridge (1993; 1995 & 2000) who has done pioneering work with regard to the OCP distributional rules in the 12<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>28</sup> The immediate cause of the formulation of these rules is – rather unexpectedly – criticism concerning the editorial practice of Alexiou (1985) with regard to the “vulgarising” E version of the *Digenis Akritis*. Contrary to Alexiou, Mackridge (1993: 338) observes a clear regularity in the placement of OCPs: “the redactor and/or scribe of the Escorial *Digenis Akritis* displays a remarkable consistency in his application of the rules governing the position of the clitic pronoun”. In other words, Mackridge has been the first to illustrate from a linguistic point of view that the language of the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry is not a complete “hotchpotch” (cf. Beaton 1996<sup>2</sup>: 215; cf. supra 1.1.1.2.1).

In parenthesis, it should be mentioned that Mackridge consciously left aside the “archaising” G manuscript, in the conviction that “in the Grottaferrata version of *Digenis Akritis*, which contains a greater number of archaic features than the Escorial version (...) the order is not the proper medieval one, but a more archaic one” (Mackridge 1993: 332; cf. supra 1.1.2.2.2). Pappas (2004), who was the first to undertake a quantitative analysis of the OCP distribution in the entire LMG period, has taken the study of Mackridge as his starting point: the earliest text from his corpus is the *Digenis Akritis*,

---

<sup>27</sup> Therefore, a statement such as that “the Grottaferrata *Digenes Akrites*, where the medieval rules are mixed with the rules of ancient and Hellenistic Greek” (Mackridge 1993: 338) perhaps gives a false impression, since the history of the Greek OCPs reads as a natural development, namely a grammaticalisation process towards convergence between phonological and syntactic host – a process that has been completed in Standard Modern Greek.

<sup>28</sup> Rollo (1989) must also be mentioned because of his pioneering work, but it is the article of Mackridge (1993), who obtained his results independently of Rollo, that has become standard due to its higher quality.

more specifically, E. The G version is again ignored. As a matter of fact, I have discovered that G is erroneously disregarded in the numerous recent studies on LMG OCPs, for even in this so-called archaising version we can identify the contemporary rules for OCPs (Soltic 2012). Consequently, Mackridge's rules have more validity than he himself realised...

In any case, the formulation of these rules by Mackridge has triggered an impressive number of publications on the distribution of LMG OCPs: I can cite Ramoutsaki (1996); Janssen (1998); Pappas (2001; 2002 & 2004); Condoravdi & Kiparsky (2001 & 2004); Janse (2000 & 2008); Vejleskov (2005); Revithiadou & Spyropoulos (2006 & 2008) and Thoma (2007). As a consequence, the LMG OCP distributional rules are by far the best studied issue in LMG syntax (Chila-Markopoulou 2004: 199). This should not surprise us, for the distributional pattern of the LMG OCPs is indeed truly fascinating.

The most important difference from the previous (post-Classical) period is that the LMG OCPs obligatorily appear adjacent to the verb of which they constitute the direct or indirect object: "the clitic object pronoun ceased to be a freely moving part of the clause and instead became part of the verb phrase" (Mackridge 1993: 339). Whether the OCPs appear before or after their verb depends on the element immediately before the verb, i.e. the preverbal element. In broad lines, preverbal OCPs are "more or less obligatory" if the verb is preceded by function words (Mackridge 1993: 340), for instance:

- (1) Καὶ ὁ ἀμὴρ ὥς τὸ ἤκουσεν, # μακρέα τὸν ἀποξέβην (DA E 52; Mackridge 1993: 328)  
E. Jeffreys (1998: 241): "When the emir heard this, he withdrew some way from the youth"

Besides this (quasi-)obligatory syntactic rule, preverbal position seems regulated by a pragmatic principle, for after "semantically emphasised" constituents preverbal OCPs are "almost obligatory" (Mackridge 1993: 341). This principle refers to the above mentioned preverbal OCPs after preferential words and ad hoc emphasised constituents (cf. *supra* 4.2.1.2.3), for example:

- (2) Κὺρ Ἥλιε, τί μᾶς ἔποικες # καὶ ἐκακοδίκησές μας; (DA E 94; Mackridge 1993: 329)  
E. Jeffreys (1998: 245): "Lord Sun, why have you done this to us and wronged us?"
- (3) Τοῦτα ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ τὰ ἔδωκεν, # ἔχει μέγιστον κάλλος (DA E 1333; Mackridge 1993: 331)<sup>29</sup>  
E. Jeffreys (1998: 339): "God has granted him all this: he has the greatest good looks"

---

<sup>29</sup> This is an example of the phenomenon of clitic doubling, more precisely: of topicalisation; cf. *infra* 5.2.3.2.1.

Needless to say, if none of the above mentioned words is present, the OCP appears immediately after the verb:

- (4) καὶ ἐθεώρει τον λοιπὸν # καὶ ἀποκαμάρωνέ τον (DA E 595; Mackridge 1993: 327)  
E. Jeffreys (1998: 283): “and gazed at him then and admired him”

Postverbal position is thus still the unmarked position of OCPs (cf. supra 4.2.1.2.3). This observation also seems to apply to OCPs which are the object of an infinitive, a participle/gerund or an imperative. In these cases, the placement of the pronouns is robustly postverbal (Pappas 2004: 70). Even after preferential words and ad hoc emphasised elements, the OCPs sometimes may occur postverbally, for OCPs occurring in combination with a preferential word/ad hoc emphasised constituent do *not necessarily* appear immediately before the verb. On the other hand, the class of function words attracts the OCPs into preverbal position almost without exception.

In sum, the distribution of LMG OCPs is determined by a quasi-obligatory syntactic rule (preverbal OCPs after function words and to a lesser extent after preferential words) and a rather optional pragmatic principle (preverbal OCPs after ad hoc emphasised constituents): “the rules are primarily a matter of syntactic context and secondarily a matter of pragmatics (in this case, emphasis)” (Mackridge 1993: 326).<sup>30</sup>

Nonetheless, although Mackridge’s description of the phenomenon has generally been accepted as the standard, the pragmatic principle has been disputed, i.e. the fact that ad hoc emphasised words trigger OCPs into preverbal position. Even the replacement of Mackridge’s rather vague notion of emphasis by the linguistically established concept of focus has not led to agreement in the field. In the core chapter of this dissertation, I will provide further evidence for the importance of the topic/focus pair (cf. infra 5.2.1.3.1).

#### 4.2.1.2.5 Standard Modern Greek

The obligatory adjacency between verb and OCP finally leads to the grammaticalisation of the OCPs in Standard Modern Greek: at this stage, the exact position of the OCP is no longer regulated by the nature of the preverbal element, but depends on the mood of the verbal form (cf. Philippaki-Warbuton 1994). If the verb is an imperative or a gerund, the OCPs appear after the verb:

---

<sup>30</sup> Of course, the pragmatic principle cannot be completely detached from syntax, since the fact that the preverbal triggering constituent must precede the verb is a very important *syntactic* restriction.

μίλα μας  
“talk to us”  
μιλώντας μας  
“talking to us”

In combination with an indicative or subjunctive, on the contrary, preverbal OCPs are required, for instance:

μας μιλά  
“(s)he talks to us”  
να μας μιλήσει  
“that (s)he would talk to us”

Note that the addition of “Standard” to Modern Greek is an important one, for some modern dialects such as Cypriot and Cappadocian have preserved the LMG distribution (cf. *infra* 5.2.1.3.3). Furthermore, Pontic has generalised the postverbal position (in the form of suffixes).<sup>31</sup> The different behaviour of the OCPs is one of the main syntactic dialectal isoglosses in Greek, since it sets Standard Modern Greek apart from other Modern Greek dialects, in particular those from Asia Minor (Kondosopoulos 1985; Ralli 2006: 141ff.). However, in the standard language phonological and syntactic host now always coincide: postverbal enclitics form the counterpart of preverbal proclitics (cf. *infra* 4.2.2.2.2).<sup>32</sup> With this perfect convergence between phonological and syntactic host, I conclude the diachronic overview and pass to my first case study.

#### 4.2.2 First case study: verbal unit

The first case study deals with one of the core syntactic patterns in Standard Modern Greek: the unit between the particle *νά* (possibly followed by OCPs) and the verb, i.e. the “verbal unit”. I will demonstrate that this unit has already been firmly established in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry. For this purpose, I rely on the distribution of those other small unstressed words: the P2 particles. By now, particles such as *γάρ*, *γοῦν*, *δ(έ)*, *μέν*, *οὔν*, which abounded in Classical Greek, had fallen into disuse in the contemporary speech and can thus be considered an archaising feature belonging to the “mixed”

---

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Ralli (2006); Pappas (2006); Janse (1994b; 2006 & 2008); Revithiadou & Spyropoulos (2006); Chatzikyriakidis (2010).

<sup>32</sup> This is why they are considered affixes by Joseph (1989).

idiom of the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry (cf. supra 1.1.1.2.2). In 5.3.1, I will extensively discuss the development of the particles.

Albeit “dead”, the particles still obey Wackernagel’s Law in my corpus: in 97.5% of the cases, the particles still occur in P2 in the IU (either P2 in the verse, or after the fixed caesura, of which we will see that it can be equated with an IU boundary; cf. infra 5.1.3.2: Table 3). However, sometimes the particles are found in a non-classical order, that is to say: they take a seemingly *postponed* position. Rather than being mistakes on the part of untrained poets or scribes, this divergence betrays more information about the contemporary language, more precisely: about the modern syntax.

#### 4.2.2.1 Verb + OCP + P2 particle

A first apparent divergence concerns the classical cluster order: remember that if an OCP co-occurs with a P2 particle, the latter must precede the former in Ancient Greek (cf. supra 4.2.1.2.1). In my whole corpus, this order is consistently reversed. In all the examples (12) in which the verb opens the half-verse and in which both an OCP and a particle appear, the particle is postponed, which results in the highly remarkable and very unclassical sequence verb + OCP + P2 particle:

- (1) εἶχαν τον γὰρ οἱ Ἕλληνες # τὸν Ἀχιλλέα Πελεΐδην (IB 801)  
“for the Greeks had him, Achilles, son of Peleus”
- (2) εἶπε τους γὰρ τὴν ἀφορμὴν # διὰ τὴν ἐξεκκληρίαν (BT 14128)  
“for he told them about the onset to expulsion”
- (3) Λέγω σε γοῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν # καὶ παραγγέλλω σέ το (LR 3393)  
“So I tell you from now on and I recommend it to you”

This clearly confirms that the LMG OCPs must be adjacent to their verb: the sequence verb + OCP now forms a phonological unit occupying P1 (cf. supra 4.2.1.2.4). There is one seemingly exception, though:

- (4) εὐχαριστῶ δέ σε πολλά, # χιλιομυριοεπαίνῳ σε (BT 339)  
“I thank you much, I honour you a thousand times”

However, most manuscripts present the alternative reading: “δέ σε X: σε δὲ ABE” (Papathomopoulos & E. Jeffreys 1996: 17). This is a nice example of where linguistic research can actually help editors (cf. supra 1.1.2.2.2).

It is necessary to invalidate the potential criticism that this order is simply determined *metri causa*. As repeatedly mentioned, the accents on particles are of an artificial nature and do not influence the stress pattern (cf. supra 4.1.1.1). As such, the

classical cluster order, verb + P2 particle + OCP, would not have any effect on the pattern of the πολιτικός στίχος. From a metrical point of view, εἶπε γάρ τους would have been perfectly possible as well.

These results show that the conflict between the two competing positioning principles, i.e. on the one hand *contemporary* LMG rule that requires that the OCPs are adjacent to their verb and on the other hand the *ancient* Law of Wackernagel which requires that the P2 particles occur immediately after the first word/constituent (i.e. the verb, in this case), is clearly resolved in favour of the *contemporary* rule. This in turn shows that the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry is far from a “hotchpotch” full of mistakes.

It is interesting to note that while in my corpus not one counterexample can be found, we still find the classical order verb + P2 particle + OCP in the 12<sup>th</sup> c. *Digenis Akritis*, at least in the “archaising” G manuscript. As for the E version, we cannot draw conclusions, such ancient particles being very rare in this vulgarising version (cf. *infra* 5.3.1.2.2), for instance:<sup>33</sup>

- (5) οἰκτεῖρω γάρ σε ὡς γυνήν # καὶ κάλλους πεπλησμένην (DA G 6.757)  
E. Jeffreys (1998: 195): “I have pity on you since you are a woman and of full beauty”
- (6) ἔξεις δέ με καὶ συνεργὸν # εἰς τοὺς ὑπεναντίους (DA G 6.770)  
E. Jeffreys (1998: 197): “and you shall have me as your comrade against your enemies”

Compare with:

- (7) δάκνει με δέ τῆς Μαξιμοῦς # ἡ πάντολμος βραδύτης (DA G 6.814)  
E. Jeffreys (1998: 199): “but what irritates me is Maximou’s most bold delay”
- (8) πεῖθει με γάρ τὸ συνειδὸς # τηρεῖν τὰ ἐναντία (DA G 4.741)  
E. Jeffreys (1998: 111): “for conscience persuades me to do the reverse”

In my view, this variation points to the fact that the language of my texts shows traces of a certain grammatical evolutions and thus constitutes a crucial witness in the history of Greek.

The fact that in the *Digenis Akritis* (both in G and – to a lesser extent – in E) constituents (γοργόν) can intervene between the subordinator ἵνα and its verb, while in my corpus this is unattested, also testifies to this, for instance:

---

<sup>33</sup> For a few more examples, see Soltic, Janse & Bentein (2013).

- (9) καὶ θεὸς βαρὺ τὸ μάσσημα # ἵνα γοργὸν γυρίζη. (DA G 4.379)  
E. Jeffreys (1998: 89): “and put on the heavy bit so that he turns quickly”

This brings me to the verbal unit with *νά*.

#### 4.2.2.2 *Νά + verb + P2 particle*

##### 4.2.2.2.1 *Standard Modern Greek*

Although Standard Modern Greek is known as a language which exhibits a great flexibility with respect to word order, this of course does not mean that its word order is completely free (cf. *infra* 5.2.1). Certain fixed ordering rules have been identified for Standard Modern Greek, predominantly by linguists working within the framework of generative grammar. The obligatory adjacency between the particle *νά* and its verb is such a strict syntactic pattern in Standard Modern Greek (Philippaki-Warbuton 1990 & 1998). *Νά* is a frequent marker in Greek: it can introduce a variety of types of clauses and is thus multifunctional (Mackridge 1985: 282ff.).<sup>34</sup> We even read: “The use of *νά* is so frequent and so varied that a systematic and comprehensive survey of its uses would be beyond the range of this book” (Mackridge 1985: 282). “Subjunctive marker” is probably the best term to cover all the functions of *νά* (Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warbuton 1997: 195; cf. Philippaki-Warbuton 1998).

No matter which kind of clause *νά* introduces, it has to constitute an uninterruptable unit with the verb: “In *νά*-clauses, the verb must immediately follow *νά*” (Mackridge 1985: 238), for instance:

θέλω ἢ Ρούλα *νά* παντρευτεῖ τό Μίμη (Mackridge 1985: 237)  
“I want Roula to marry Mimis”

As such, Philippaki-Warbuton (1998: 167) argues against an interpretation of *νά* as an ordinary complementiser, since these keep a distance from the verb and thus allow any other sentence constituent to intervene between them and the verb. Hence, Joseph (1981: 144) calls *νά* a verbal particle, analogous to an element like English *to*.

---

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warbuton (1997: 196ff.); Mackridge (1985: 282ff.) divides the types into two major sections: *νά* followed by a main verb and *νά* followed by a subordinate verb.

#### 4.2.2.2.2 Ancient Greek

To understand why *vá* is so important in Standard Modern Greek, it is again important to look back in time. The particle *vá* is etymologically derived from *ἵνα*, which is a subordinator in Ancient Greek. More precisely, *ἵνα* introduces final, consecutive and control clauses and the verb in the subordinate clause thus normally takes the subjunctive mood (Horrocks 2010<sup>2</sup>: 277f.). In Ancient Greek, the subordinator *ἵνα* is – like other subordinators – not obligatorily followed by the verb. As the following example from Plato illustrates, *ἵνα* and its verb (*δηλώσω*) can easily be interrupted by several constituents:

*ἵνα δὲ σαφέστερον ὃ λέγω δηλώσω, τῇδὲ μοι συνεπίσπεσθε.* (Plato, *Critias* 107b4)  
“But in order that I may explain my meaning more clearly, pray follow me further”

Consider the particle *δέ*, which nicely occupies the Wackernagel-position. Remember that in the *Digenis Akritis* too a constituent can still intervene between *ἵνα* and the verb (cf. supra 4.2.2.1).

With regard to the phonological evolution from the ancient subordinator *ἵνα* to the modern marker *vá*, the following steps have been hypothesised: via aphaeresis, which is a common phonological phenomenon in LMG, the /i/ is omitted (Horrocks 2010<sup>2</sup>: 276f.). Before this deletion of the initial vowel, however, there must have been a shift of the stress to the final syllable *α*, which results in the scheme: *ἵνα* => *ίνά* => *vά* => *vα* (Horrocks 2010<sup>2</sup>: 277ff.; cf. Browning 1999<sup>2</sup>: 43). In its current stage, *vά* should indeed be written without an accent, for it has lost its stress and turned into a proclitic which has to lean on the following word to constitute a phonological word (Horrocks 1990: 50).

#### ***Excursus: from enclitic to proclitic OCPs***

The rise of the particle *vά* has been related to one of the major evolutions in the syntax of Standard Modern Greek, i.e. the transition from *enclitic* to *proclitic* OCPs. It seems appropriate to go more deeply into this change (cf. supra 4.2.1.2.5). In LMG, it is difficult to decide over the OCPs' precise prosodic nature: “Whether or not the Medieval Greek pronouns were still enclitic, as in Ancient Greek, or had become proclitic (...), is a moot question” (Janse 2008: 181). Condoravdi & Kiparsky (2004: 172ff.) believe that the LMG OCPs are still enclitic and thus lean to the preceding word, even if this is not the verb (but a subordinator for instance). Pappas (2004: 101ff.), on the other hand, is convinced that the LMG OCPs are of a hybrid nature. In his view, their only possible phonological host has become the verb and dependent on their exact position they are proclitic (if preverbal) or enclitic (if postverbal). Revithiadou & Spyropoulos (2006: 30) totally agree



with Pappas. However, what is certain is that at some time a reanalysis of the direction of the phonological dependence must have taken place, namely from the left (enclitic) to the right (proclitic), and that the obligatory “verb-dependency” of the OCPs in LMG has been the initial impetus (cf. supra 4.2.1.2.4).

Here, *ἵνα/νά* comes into play according to Horrocks (1990: 49): “The history of *ἵνα* is vital in this connection”. Both *ἵνα* and *νά*, as a subordinator and its “derivative”, attract the OCPs into preverbal position in LMG (Pappas 2004: 156). I give two examples from my corpus:

- (10) Ἐγὼ δὲ ὡς ἠθέλησα # *ἵνα* τὸν ἐρωτήσω,  
 πάλιν ἐλάλουν πρὸς αὐτὸν # καὶ ἐνέγκαζά τον πλέον (LR 68-69)  
 “I, since I wanted to ask him questions,  
 again spoke to him and forced him to (tell) more”

- (11) οἱ στρατιῶται πάραυτα # ὥρμησαν *να* τὸν πιάσουν (VC 206)  
 “the soldiers immediately rushed to grab him”

Horrocks (1990), one of the pioneers in the study of LMG OCPs, has been the first to propose that the phonological evolution from *ἵνα* as a phonologically independent subordinator to the preverbal proclitic particle *νά* is relevant to the reanalysis from enclitic to proclitic OCPs:

“As long as *να* (...) retains sufficient phonological independence to host a following clitic, the naturally enclitic status of the pronouns (...) can remain. When, however, the particle comes effectively to cliticise to the right, there are only two possibilities for the associated clitic pronouns. Either they remain enclitic and therefore cease to appear in this position altogether, or they themselves become proclitic, forming a clitic group with the preceding particle, and attach to the following verb” (Horrocks 1990: 50)

Obviously, the Standard Modern Greek OCPs have chosen the latter option. Eventually, the “reinterpretation” (Horrocks 2010<sup>2</sup>: 280) of clisis direction is – by analogy – extended to other modal particles such as *θά* (derived from *θέλω νά*) and *ἄς*, as well as to the negatives. Later on, the OCPs also appear before the verb even in the absence of these preverbal particles (Horrocks 2010<sup>2</sup>: 280). Finally, indicatives start to follow the model of the subjunctives and as such preverbal proclitic OCPs become generalised in Standard Modern Greek (Horrocks 1990: 51).<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Horrocks (2010<sup>2</sup>: 280); Soltic & Janse (2012: 246).

It must be emphasised that not all varieties of Greek have evolved along the same path: the above observations only apply to Standard Modern Greek and the south-western dialects, on which the standard language has mainly been based (cf. supra 4.2.1.2.5). Therefore, it might be expected that texts originating in the Peloponnese, such as the *Chronicle of Morea* and the *War of Troy* (cf. supra 3.3.1.2), show early traces of this development towards proclisis. Whereas postverbal position is the default position for the OCPs if the verb opens the IU, the *Chronicle of Morea* indeed shows some preverbal examples, as Mackridge (1993: 333; fn 2) had already noted. This is also observed by Chila-Markopoulou (2004: 210; fn 6), who gives the following two examples:<sup>36</sup>

(12) σὲ θέλει ἐβγάλει ἐκ τὸν Μορέαν, # ὅπου οὐδὲν ἔχεις δίκαιον (CoM H 4125)

Lurier (1964: 192): “he will put you out of Morea, to which you have no right”

(13) μὲ ἤφερεν ἡ ὄρεξις # κ’ ἐπίασα τὸ βιβλίον (CoM H 7638)

Lurier (1964: 286): “a whim led me to take up the book”

Pappas (2004: 87), on the other hand, denies that the *Chronicle of Morea* foreshadows the change towards proclisis:

“texts from western Greece that were written much later (almost three centuries later in some cases) than the *Chronicle of Moreas* favor postverbal pronoun placement at the beginning of clauses. That information (...) argues against the suggestion that what is found in Moreas is the inception of dialect differentiation. Whatever the reasons for it, preverbal pronoun placement in clause-initial position is a phenomenon unique to this text”

This observation corresponds to the view that we cannot (yet) find dialectal diversification in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry (cf. supra 1.1.1.2.1).

However, my own impression is that the other text of my corpus originating in the Peloponnese, i.e. the *War of Troy*, which is unfortunately excluded from Pappas’ corpus, shows a similar tendency (perhaps due to influence of the Romance languages?), for example:

(14) Ὁ Γκός, ἱατρὸς ὁ θαυμαστός, # ὁ Ἀνατολικάϊος,

“Gkos, the wonderful doctor, the Anatolian one,

τὸν ὕγιανε πολλὰ γοργόν, # τίποτε δὲν ἐγνώθει (BT 6280-6281)

cured him [Hektor] very quickly, he felt nothing”

---

<sup>36</sup> Cf. infra 5.3.4.1.

- (15) Μετὰ μεγάλης καὶ φρικτῆς # τῆς ταπεινοφροσύνης  
 “Wit a large and frightening modesty”  
 τὸ ἐπροσκυνῆσαν Ἑλληνες # καὶ παρελάβανέ το. (BT 11887-11888)  
 “the Greeks worshipped it [the Pelladion] and accepted it”

#### 4.2.2.2.3 Late Medieval Greek

Let us return to the modern unit between νά and the verb: can this pattern already be identified in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry? In the eight texts of my corpus, νά occurs 33 times in combination with a P2 particle (γάρ, γοῦν, δ(έ), μέν, οὔν). In each case, the particle is seemingly postponed: it does not occur immediately after νά, but after the combination νά + verb. However, if we consider νά + verb as one phonological unit occupying P1, the distribution of these 33 particles does not deviate from the other particles, which nicely obey Wackernagel’s Law:

- (16) νά κρίνη γὰρ τυραννικὰ # ὡς φυσικὸς αὐθέντης. (IB 196)  
 “so that he judges in a tyrannical way, as a natural ruler”
- (17) νά μάθετε δὲ ἅπαντες, # νά πληροφορηθῇτε (AB 14)  
 “so that you will all learn, you will be informed”
- (18) νά ἀφῆστε γὰρ τοὺς τόπους σας # καὶ τὴν ἀνάπαψίν σας (CoM H 3760)  
 Lurier (1964: 182): “to leave your lands and ease”
- (19) ἀξιῶ σε καὶ παρακαλῶ # νά ποιήσης γὰρ ἐτοῦτο (CoM H 5652)  
 Lurier (1964: 235): “I again beseech you and pray you will do this”

The fact that νά + verb is truly conceived as a unit is also shown by the following two – exceptional – examples in which Wackernagel’s Law is violated:<sup>37</sup>

- (20) τοὺς Ἑλλήνας νά ποιήσῃ γὰρ # ὀπίσω νά στραφοῦσι. (BT 7918)  
 “so that he takes care that the Greeks return later”
- (21) Κακὰ νά ἦσουν γὰρ υἱὸς # ἐκείνου τοῦ Τυδέου (BT 8783)  
 “It would have been a bad thing if, being the son of the great Tydeus...”

There is one apparent exception:

- (22) Τί νά δὲ λέγω τὰ πολλὰ # καὶ νά σὲ τὰ ἐμορφίζω; (CoM H 753)  
 Lurier (1964: 89): “Why should I tell you too much and embellish it”

<sup>37</sup> These 2 examples belong to the 2.5% instances which do not occupy P2; cf. infra 5.1.3.2: Table 3.

However, this is not a true exception, but a mistake of the editor: the particle δέ should be changed to σέ, the OCP. As a matter of fact, τί νὰ σὲ λέγω τὰ πολλά functions as a formula (occupying the first half-verse) in the *Chronicle of Morea*, for instance:

(23) Τί νὰ σέ λέγω τὰ πολλά # πολλάκις νὰ βαρεῖσαι;<sup>38</sup> (CoM H 203)

Lurier (1964: 73): “Why should I tell you much the many details if perhaps you will be bored?”

Furthermore, the parallel verse of manuscript P also presents the correct wording:

(24) Τί νὰ σέ λέγω τὰ πολλά # καὶ νὰ σὲ τὰ φουμίζω; (CoM P 753)

“Why should I tell you the details and embroider them for you?”

In parenthesis, this is again a nice example of where linguistic research can actually help editors (cf. supra 1.1.2.2.2).

#### 4.2.2.3 Νά + OCP + verb + P2 particle

The above example constitutes the perfect transition to the next two examples, which can be interpreted as a combination of the two above observations (4.2.2.1: unit between the verb and the OCP + 4.2.2.2: unit between νά and the verb). An OCP stands between νά and the verb and the particles are again found after this whole complex:

(25) νὰ τὴν φυλάξῃ δὲ καλὰ # ἔνι καὶ φρόνησίς του. (BT 8614)

“but to preserve it [honour] should be his (major) concern”

(26) νὰ τὸν μαδίζῃ γὰρ τινὰς # καὶ μάχην νὰ τοῦ κάμνῃ (CoM H 4341)

Lurier (1964: 198): “[should anyone] despoil him and make war on him”

Indeed, as in Standard Modern Greek, OCPs are allowed to intrude the unit (Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warbuton 1997: 196).<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> Cf. CoM H 482, 548, 845, 1092, 1734, 2524, 2923.

<sup>39</sup> Beside OCPs, the negative markers μή(ν)/δεν are the only other elements allowed to interrupt the verbal unit in Standard Modern Greek. Unfortunately, the number of co-occurrences of μή(ν)/δεν and a P2 particle in my corpus is too small to allow significant conclusions. However, the 2 examples (both from the *Chronicle of Morea*) which I have found do follow the modern pattern, for the P2 particle is “postponed”:

(1) μὴ τὰ πιστέψῃ γὰρ κανεῖς, # ψέματα εἶναι μεγάλα. (CoM H 3897)

“no one should believe them, they were huge lies”

(2) μὴ πιάσῃ γὰρ καὶ ἀπελθῇ # ἐκεῖ στήν Ἀνδραβίδα (CoM H 5044)

“he shouldn’t set off and go from there to Andravida”

On the other hand, the ancient negations οὐ(κ) and οὐδέ(ν) do not seem to prevent the “intervention” of the particle:

(27) Να σου τα δώσω; (Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warburton 1997: 197)

“Should I give them to you?”

Philippaki-Warburton (1990) calls this tight unit the “ρηματικό σύνολο”, which I translate as “verbal unit”. Joseph (1992: 34) speaks of the “ρηματικό σύμπλεγμα” or “verbal complex”. The verbal unit is considered crucial in Modern Greek syntax, as Joseph writes on his personal webpage:<sup>40</sup>

“The verbal complex that results from the combination of the verb with weak pronouns is the core of the Modern Greek clause structure, since tense, mood, and negation markers also form part of this complex”

Finally, I would like to point to the existence of a construction which is comparable to the verbal unit with νά, but one which is peculiar to LMG, namely the so-called nominalised (Horrocks 2010<sup>2</sup>: 289) or circumstantial infinitive (Holton & Manolissou 2010: 550). This construction consists of the article τό and the infinitive:

“the nominalised infinitive which, in popular speech, was increasingly restricted to use as a temporal adverbial adjunct: thus τὸ ἰδεῖν (...) is used to mean ‘when/after s/he had seen...’ in vernacular texts of the later middle ages” (Horrocks 2010<sup>2</sup>: 289)

In its normal use, i.e. defining a noun phrase, the definite article can easily be followed by a P2 particle, as the next two examples demonstrate:

(28) τὸ δε τρυγόνιν ἔφερε # νερόν με τὰ πτερὰ του (VC 1184)

“the dove carried water with its wings”

(29) τὸ δε παιδίον ὁ Ἀχιλλεύς # ἐπόνεσεν καρδίᾳ (AB 212)

“but the child Achilles suffered in his heart”

---

(3) οὐ γὰρ προσάψω, δέσποινα, # τὸν ἰδικόν μου αὐθέντα. (VC 990)

“I will not touch, mistress, my own man”

(4) ὅλοι φωνάζουν, λέγουσιν, # οὐδὲν γὰρ τοὺς ἀρέσει (BT 5652)

“all yelled, called, for it didn’t please them”

(5) οὐδὲν γὰρ εἶχαν καμποσῶς # φωνὴν κἄν νὰ συντύχουν. (AB 1737)

“for they had no voice at all to talk”

When the OCPs co-occur with the negation, the resulting order is the following: Να μην του τα δώσει.

“(S)he shouldn’t give them to him” (Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warburton 1997: 197).

<sup>40</sup> Statement taken from <http://www.ling.ohio-state.edu/~bjoseph/articles/gmodern.htm> (last access on 25/11/14).

On the other hand, when functioning as a nominaliser, the definite article should immediately be followed by the infinitive and the P2 particle is “postponed” (12 examples):

(30) Τὸ ἀκούσει δὲ ὅτι ἔχομεν # τὴν πόλιν ἐδικήν μας (BT 887)

“When they hear that we possess our own city”

(31) ἐκεῖνο εἰς κάμπο ἐκοίτετον• # τὸ ἰδεῖ γὰρ τὰ φουσσᾶτα (CoM H 2028-2029)

Lurier (1964: 130): “[Nikli] which lay in a plain. Now, seeing the Frankish armies...”

(32) τὸ σώσει δὲ τὰ πλευτικά # τὸν γῦρον τὸ ἐγυρίσαν. (CoM H 1698)

Lurier (1964: 118): “but, arriving there, the ships encircled it all around”

Again, the OCP forms an uninterruptible unit with its verb, which is in this case the infinitive:

(33) Τὸ ἰδεῖ τοὺς γὰρ οἱ Κούμανοι, # ἐκεῖνοι ὅπου ἐκουρσεῦαν (CoM H 1139)

Lurier (1964: 100): “Now, when the Cumans who were pillaging saw that they had come out against them”

This construction has no descendant in Standard Modern Greek, though, because the infinitive has died out and the nominalised infinitive has been replaced by other constructions. Thus, it seems to be a rather short-lived phenomenon restricted to LMG (Joseph 2000: 318).

To sum up, my first case study has made clear that the verbal unit, which is important in the current grammar of Greek, is consistently respected in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry. This shows that this type of poetry should not automatically be classified as unsuitable for any kind of linguistic research and that its description of a “hotchpotch” is undeserved.

#### 4.2.3 Second case study: OCPs in the parallel versions of the *Chronicle of Morea*

In my second case study, I will concentrate on the *Chronicle of Morea*, which provides us with a unique situation: by comparing its two parallel manuscripts (H & P) as regards the distribution of OCPs, I will not only show that the contemporary OCP rules are respected, but I will also uncover the many rephrasing possibilities on the metrical, morphological, lexical and even syntactic levels (cf. supra 1.1.1.2.1).

### 4.2.3.1 Relevant parallel pairs

I have compared the position of OCPs in H with their position in P. In the majority of the parallel verses containing an OCP, no difference is seen. In a number of cases, the position of the OCP does differ in a meaningful way. However, not all these verses in which the OCPs significantly differ in H and P are taken into account. In order to render the results of this case study as clear as possible, I have filtered out those half-verses which deviate from what is considered the standard metrical pattern of the πολιτικὸς στίχος (without claiming these verses are unauthentic, though) (cf. supra 4.1.1.1).<sup>41</sup> The following example, for instance, is excluded, because the first half-verse of P is hypometrical – seven syllables instead of the required eight:

- (1) τὸ πῶς τὸν παρακαλῶ # νὰ ὀρίση, νὰ μὲ δώσουν (CoM P 8211)  
“that I request him to direct that you be given [water]”

As the table reveals, 263 “perfect” verses are left:

Table 1 Half-verses in the *Chronicle of Morea*

Metrically correct or metrically incorrect half-verse?	Total of half-verses in which OCP significantly differs in H and P: 323
Metrically incorrect half-verse: hypo- or hypermetrical	27
Metrically incorrect half-verse: deviating stress pattern	33
Metrically correct half-verse	263

Then, I have attempted to streamline the relevant parallel pairs by tentatively dividing them into four categories: H differs from P with respect to 1) the structure in which the OCP appears (4.2.3.2); 2) the preverbal trigger (4.2.3.3); 3) the syllabic position at which the OCP occurs (4.2.3.4) or 4) the precise position of the OCP with regard to the verb (4.2.3.5). The first and second category will primarily confirm that the distribution of OCPs is not subject to (metrical) arbitrariness, but generally obeys the outlined rules (cf. supra 4.2.1.2.4). The third and the fourth category will especially prove that the πολιτικὸς στίχος poet has the freedom to make certain alternations without disrupting the metrical structure.

<sup>41</sup> I have taken the half-verse and not the verse as my standard, since this is a relatively independent autonomous unit, as we will see; cf. infra 5.1.

The phrase “make certain alternations” may mistakenly seem to imply the idea that the scribe of P consciously rewrites H. As mentioned, no evidence exists that the scribe of P had the version of H at his disposal (cf. *supra* 3.3.2.2). Therefore, the term “difference” is a more appropriate term than “change” to describe the dissimilarities between the parallel pairs. However, it is almost impossible to compare two things without using words which imply an active author, such as “compensate”, etc.

#### 4.2.3.2 Structural difference; different position

First, in a number of cases, a preverbal OCP in H corresponds with a postverbal OCP in P (or vice versa), because i) in the one manuscript the element before the verb, which triggers the OCP into preverbal position, is behind the verb in the other manuscript; ii) H & P differ in structure; iii) the preverbal trigger is simply absent in one of the two manuscripts.

##### *Preverbal trigger behind the verb*

I start my analysis with parallel pairs in which the difference is primarily of a syntactic nature: a change in word order. To begin with, the constituent which appears immediately before the verb and thus triggers the OCP into preverbal position in the one manuscript might stand after the verb in the other one, in which case it leads to postverbal OCPs, in accordance with the outlined rules, for instance:

- (2) τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐπαρέδωκεν # κι ἀπῆραν τὸ οἱ ἄγγελοι (CoM H 7804)

Lurier (1964: 290): “he surrendered his soul, and the angels took it”

cf. τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐπαράδωκεν, # οἱ ἄγγελοι τὸ ἐπῆραν (CoM P 7804)

- (3) “Πρίγκιπα, ἐσὺ θεωρεῖς # κ’ ἐβλέπεις τὸ ἄτός σου (CoM H 4222)

Lurier (1964: 195): “Prince, you yourself see and observe”

cf. “Πρίγκιπα, ἐσὺ θεωρεῖς, # ἄτός σου τὸ ἐβλέπεις (CoM P 4222)

We find phonological, lexical and morphological differences which allow to maintain the correctness of the verse structure. The following contrastive pairs provide good examples. In the next one, a hiatus occurs between τα and ἐκ in P, while elision takes place between τὰ and εἶχαν in H. Moreover, both manuscripts have another preposition: ἀπό in H and its synonym ἐκ in P:

- (4) ἐπεῖν τὰ εἶχαν καὶ κρατοῦν # ἀπὸ τὸν Πάπαν τὰ εἶχαν. (CoM H 2647)

Lurier (1964: 149): “[declared that] what they had and held, they had from the pope”



cf. ὅτι τὰ εἶχαν καὶ κρατοῦν, # εἶχαν τα ἐκ τὸν Πάπαν. (CoM P 2647)

In P, the adjective καλόν is used rather than ὀνόστιμον, which has a similar meaning (“good”):

- (5) πολλὰ τοῦ ἐφάνη ὀνόστιμον, # ἐχάρην το μεγάλως (CoM H 6566)

Lurier (1964: 259): “it seemed to him most agreeable and he rejoiced at it”

cf. ἐφάνη του πολλὰ καλόν, # ἐχάρηκε μεγάλως (CoM P 6566)

In P, the particle γάρ is absent.<sup>42</sup> A hiatus occurs between τα and ἐκεῖνος, while in H elision takes place between τά and ἐποιῆσεν. Rather than the verb ποιῶ (“to do”), we find the more concrete χτίζω (“to build”) in P:<sup>43</sup>

- (6) τὴν Μάινην καὶ τὸν Μυζηθρᾶ, # ἐκεῖνος γὰρ τα ἐποιῆσεν (CoM H 4462)

Lurier (1964: 201): “Maine and Mistra were built by him”

cf. τῆς Μάνης μετὰ τὸν Μυζηθρᾶ # ἔχτισέν τα ἐκεῖνος (CoM P 4462)

In the next example, H has ἐμέναν, while P contains ἐμᾶς. This is a morphological difference, since ἐμέναν refers to the first person singular, while ἐμᾶς is a plural pronoun. A hiatus occurs between ἀπό and ἐμᾶς, while in H we find a (written) elision between ἀπ’ and ἐμέναν:

- (7) Γίνωσκε, ἀφέντη βασιλέα, # κράτει το ἀπ’ ἐμέναν (CoM H 5320)

Lurier (1964: 226): “Know, O lord basileus, have it from me”

cf. Γίνωσκε, ἀφέντη πρίγκιπα, # ἀπὸ ἐμᾶς τὸ κράτειε (CoM P 5320)

### *Another structure*

In the following pairs, the preverbal trigger in the one manuscript corresponds with another syntactic structure in the other manuscript. In the following example, the verb πληροφορῶ is in P subdivided into the rather weakly used verb λέγω and the direct object πληροφορίαν. Since the direct object constitutes the most important information, it is emphasised and as such attracts the OCP into preverbal position:<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> The fact that a P2 particle can easily be omitted in the parallel version testifies to the particle’s bleached discourse role; cf. *infra* 5.3.1.2.2.

<sup>43</sup> The verb ποιῶ is so-called light verb; cf. *infra* 5.2.2.

<sup>44</sup> The verb λέγω might also be compared to light verbs; cf. *infra* 5.2.2.2.3.

Note that the OCP refers to something totally different in P (σᾶς instead of το).

- (8) Καὶ ἄλλο πάλε σᾶς λαλῶ, # πληροφοροῦν ἐθέτω (CoM H 715)  
Lurier (1964: 88): “And, furthermore, I tell you something else, be advised of it”

cf. Κι ἄλλο πάλιν ἡξεύρετε, # πληροφορίαν σᾶς λέγω (CoM P 715)

However, the most common type of a different syntactic structure is when the nominalised infinitive corresponds with a temporal clause introduced by the function word ὥς. Whereas postverbal OCPs are the norm after the infinitive, the second construction – with the function word – requires preverbal OCPs, for instance:<sup>45</sup>

- (9) Τὸ ἀκούσει τὸ ὁ πρίγκιπας # κ’ ἐκεῖνοι τῆς βουλῆς του (CoM H 6335)  
Lurier (1964: 253): “When the prince and those of his council heard this”

cf. Ὡς τὸ ἤκουσεν ὁ πρίγκιπας # κ’ ἐκεῖνοι τῆς βουλῆς του (CoM P 6335)<sup>46</sup>

Once, such a temporal clause corresponds with the gerund, which is also associated with postverbal OCPs, as in Standard Modern Greek:

- (10) Ἀκούσονται τὸ οἱ ἄρχοντες, # οἱ πρῶτοι τῆς Βενετίας (CoM H 351)  
Lurier (1964: 77): “When the archons, the leaders of Venice, heard it”

cf. Ὡς τὸ ἤκουσαν οἱ ἄρχοντες # τῆς Βενετίας οἱ πρῶτοι (CoM P 351)

### *Absence of the preverbal trigger*

If the preverbal trigger of the one manuscript is absent in the other, we expect a postverbal OCP in the latter. In the next example, there is no function word in P:

- (11) ὥς φρόνιμους ποῦ σᾶς θεωρῶ # πληροφορίαν σᾶς λέγω (CoM H 1618)  
Lurier (1964: 116): “I tell these facts to you as the wise men I see you to be”

cf. ὁρῶ σᾶς γὰρ ὥς φρόνιμους # καὶ καθαρὰ σᾶς λέγω (CoM P 1618)

Note also the use of the synonym: ὁρῶ has the same meaning as θεωρῶ.

A preferential word/ad hoc emphasised constituent (such as the strong personal pronoun αὐτοί) can also be absent:

---

<sup>45</sup> Cf. CoM H 1196, 5785, 6069, 6096, 6506, 7135, 7166, 7194, 8406, 8707, 8687.

<sup>46</sup> This is a nice example of an afterthought construction (a corrective afterthought lacking in verbal agreement to be precise), which we will discuss below; cf. *infra* 5.1.3.3.

(12) καὶ ἄλλοι φίλους εἶχασιν # καὶ ὠδηγέψανε τους. (CoM H 7075)

Lurier (1964: 271): “and others had friends who guided them”

cf. καὶ ἄλλοι εἶχαν φίλους τους # κι αὐτοὶ τους ὠδηγέψαν. (CoM P 7075)

Note the slight difference between ὠδηγέψανε-ὠδηγέψαν. Rather than a morphological difference, this is a phonological difference, which continues to exist in Standard Modern Greek.<sup>47</sup> Because final -ν has become labile, a final ε is added in order to keep the personal ending distinctive (Browning 1999<sup>2</sup>: 81). Together with the hiatus between καί and ὠδηγέψανε, this helps to obtain the fixed number of seven syllables in the second half-verse.

In the next example, a morphological difference is found. While in H we find the verb ἐσυχνάσαν, P contains the longer ἐσυχνάσασιν. The ending -σιν doublemarks the third person plural. Note that in the first half-verse, the reverse happens: ἐστήσασιν in P corresponds with the shorter ἔστησαν:

(13) τὰ τριπουτσέτα ἐστήσασιν # κ’ ἐκεῖ τους ἐσυχνάσαν (CoM H 1700)

Lurier (1964: 118): “they set up the trebuchets and struck repeatedly at them therein”

cf. τὰ τριπουτζέτα ἔστησαν # καὶ ἐσυχνάσασιν τους (CoM P 1700)

In the next pair, the verb is subject to lexical variation: we find ἀποκτείνω in H, while P has its synonym κατακόπτω:

(14) εἰς τὸ σπαθὶ τοὺς ἔβαλαν, # ὅλους τους ἀπεκτεῖναν. (CoM H 619)

Lurier (1964: 86): “[at that moment] they put to the sword, they killed them all”

cf. εἰς τὸ σπαθὶ τοὺς ἔβαλαν # καὶ ἐκατέκοψάν τους. (CoM P 619)

In sum, this first category not only provides strong evidence of the validity of the outlined rules for OCP distribution in LMG, but also demonstrates the flexibility of the πολιτικός στίχος from a phonological, morphological, lexical and syntactic perspective. We will see that these sources of variation recur in the other three categories below.

#### 4.2.3.3 Similar preverbal trigger; same position

In my second category, P has another preverbal constituent than H, which, however, also belongs to one of the three triggering categories (function word, preferential word

---

<sup>47</sup> The form with -ε is said to be more colloquial (Mackridge 2010: 582).

or ad hoc emphasised element). As expected, the OCPs in P are also preverbal. For instance, both the temporal conjunction ἐνῶ and the relative pronoun ὅπου belong to the class of function words:

- (15) τὴν Τσάραν, ποῦ εἰς τὴν Σκλαβουνίαν # ἐνῶ μᾶς ροβολουέει (CoM H 426)  
Lurier (1964: 79): “Zara, which is in Slavonia and which is in revolt against us”

cf. τὴν Τσάραν, ὅπου εἰς τὴν Σκλαβουνίαν # ὅπου μᾶς ροβελέψη (CoM P 426)

Note the use of the (quasi-)synonyms εἰς ἀλήθειον and στερέα in the next pair. In H, elision takes place between κρατῇ and εἰς, so that the second half-verse does not contain more than seven syllables:

- (16) εἰπέτε του εἰς πληροφορίαν # ἄς τὸ κρατῇ εἰς ἀλήθειον (CoM H 8395)  
Lurier (1964: 305): “tell him as information that he may hold to be true”

cf. εἰπέ τον εἰς πληροφορία # νὰ τὸ κρατῇ στερέα (CoM P 8395)

The verbs in H and P are synonyms: both λαλέω and συντυχαίνω mean “to speak”:

- (17) Κι ὁ ρῆγας τοῦ ἀποκρίθηκεν, # τὰ ἐτέτοια τοῦ ἐλάλει (CoM H 5793)  
Lurier (1964: 238): “And the king answered him and spoke such words”

cf. Κι ὁ ρῆγας ἀπεκρίθηκεν, # οὕτως τὸν συντυχαίνει (CoM P 5793)

Note that elision in H (τ’ ἐλυπήθην) corresponds with a hiatus in P:

- (18) Ὁ ρῆγας γάρ, ὡς τὸ ἤκουσεν, # μεγάλως τὸ ἐλυπήθην (CoM H 459)  
Lurier (1964: 81): “Now, the king, when he heard this, greatly sorrowed at it”

cf. Κι ὁ ρῆγας, ὡς τὸ ἤκουσεν, # πολλὰ τὸ ἐλυπήθην (CoM P 459)

The next example reminds us of the pairs with a syntactic difference: the verb συμβουλεύει in P corresponds with an emphasised direct object βουλήν and a weakly used, so-called light verb δίδει in H (cf. *infra* 5.2.2):

- (19) καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν πρίγκιπα, # τέτοιαν βουλήν τοῦ δίδει (CoM H 6305)  
Lurier (1964: 253): “and he spoke to the prince, giving him this counsel”

cf. καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν πρίγκιπαν, # οὕτως τὸν συμβουλεύει (CoM P 6305)

The same applies to the following pair: δειλιάζω (“to quail”) in H correspond with δειλία (“fear”) and the weakly used verb ἐπαίρνω (“to take”). In H, ἐδειλιάσεν is reinforced by

εἰς σφόδρα, which is – just like δειλία in P – emphasised and is thus responsible for the preverbal position of the OCP:

(20) μεγάλως τὸ ἐλυπήθηκεν # κ' εἰς σφόδρα τὸ ἐδειλιάσεν. (CoM H 3114)

Lurier (1964: 164): “he was deeply grieved and lost courage completely”

cf. μεγάλως ἐλυπήθηκεν, # δειλία τὸν ἐπῆρεν. (CoM P 3114)

In the next example, the ad hoc emphasised prepositional phrase εἰς σφόδρα corresponds with the preferential adverb πολλά. P uses the OCP τόν rather than τό, which makes elision with ἐπαινέσαν impossible:

(21) ὅλοι τὸ ἀγαπήσασιν # κ' εἰς σφόδρα τὸ ἐπαινέσαν. (CoM H 6336)

Lurier (1964: 253): “all were pleased with it and praised it highly”

cf. ὅλοι τὸ ἠγαπήσασιν, # πολλά τὸν ἐπαινέσαν. (CoM P 6336)

These examples truly confirm the observation that the nature of the word immediately preceding the verb is crucial with regard to the position of the OCP (cf. supra 4.2.1.2.4).

#### 4.2.3.4 Same (lack of) preverbal trigger; different syllabic position

In my third category, the preverbal trigger is the same in H and P, but its position is slightly different and – with it – the position of the OCP, which now occupies a different syllabic position. I have also included pairs in which postverbal OCPs occupy a different syllabic position.<sup>48</sup> I have added the syllabic position at which the OCP occurs between brackets.

##### *Preverbal OCPs*

In many examples, the slightly different position of the OCP is the result of the absence/presence of a small word such as the definite article, a P2 particle or καί.<sup>49</sup> This absence/presence of a single syllable is often “compensated” by phonological means. In the next example, for instance, P has no particle γάρ yet a hiatus (rather than an elision) occurs between τό and ἐχάρη:

<sup>48</sup> Remember that the accent of OCPs is not relevant with regard to the stress pattern; cf. supra 4.1.1.1.

<sup>49</sup> For the bleached discourse role of the P2 articles, see infra 5.3.1.2.2.

(22) Τὸ ἀκούσει το ὁ πρίγκιπας, # μεγάλως γὰρ τὸ ἐχάρη (13) (CoM H 2850)

Lurier (1964: 155): “When the prince heard this, he was overjoyed”

cf. Τὸ ἀκούσει το ὁ πρίγκιπας, # μεγάλως τὸ ἐχάρη (12) (CoM P 2850)

In the next pair, elision affects ποῦ and εἶναι in H. In P, in which the one-syllable word καί is absent, a hiatus occurs between the same words. Note that this is also an example of a syntactic difference, since the order of the constituents (the clauses νὰ σὲ δείξω and ποῦ εἶναι) differs:

(23) λέγει του• “Ἐλθε μετὰ μὲ # καὶ νὰ σὲ δείξω ποῦ εἶναι.” (11) (CoM H 5426)

Lurier (1964: 229): “he said to him: ‘Come with me and I will show you where they are’”

cf. λέγει τον• “Ἐλα μετ’ ἐμὲν # ποῦ εἶναι νὰ σὲ δείξω.” (13) (CoM P 5426)

The absence of synizesis is another way to cope with one extra syllable. As the change of accent signals, there is no synizesis of ἐβιάζαν in P:

(24) Τόσα τὸν ἀναγκάσασιν # καὶ τόσα τὸν ἐβιάσαν (12) (CoM H 2512)

Lurier (1964: 145): “They so pressed him and urged him”

cf. Τόσο τὸν ἀναγκάσασι, # τόσο τὸν ἐβιάζαν (11) (CoM P 2512)

The absence/presence of a small word might also be “compensated” by morphological means, as in the next example in which the ending of the verb differs: the shorter -σιν versus the longer -σασι:

(25) ὅπου γὰρ τὸν ἐτρέμασιν # ’ς ὅλην τὴν Ρωμανίαν (4) (CoM H 3220)

Lurier (1964: 167): “before whom they trembled in all of Romania”

cf. ὅπου τὸν ἐτρεμάσασι # ’ς ὅλην τὴν Ρωμανίαν (3) (CoM P 3220)

Better-known and more widespread pairs of endings in LMG are the variants -ουν and -ουσι (present tense) and -αν and -ασι (past tense) (Browning 1999<sup>2</sup>: 81; cf. supra 1.1.1.2.1), for instance:

(26) νὰ τοῦ βοηθήσουν κἄν ποσῶς # στὴν μάχην ὅπου εἶχεν. (2) (CoM H 2665)

Lurier (1964: 149): “to help him in any way whatever in the war he was waging”

cf. πῶς νὰ τὸν βοηθήσουσιν # στὴν μάχην ὅπου ἔχει. (3) (CoM P 2665)

The difference in verb endings is not the only morphological variation in the above example. The alternation between genitive (H) and accusative (P) OCP must also be

noted. Both cases can be used to replace the extinct dative and thus to express the indirect object (cf. Browning 1999<sup>2</sup>: 58).<sup>50</sup>

The flexibility with regard to endings and cases can be considered aspects of inflectional morphology. However, derivational morphology also offers many possibilities. In the next example, for instance, H, which does not contain the particle γάρ, has a verb with a prefix (ὕπ-):

(27) ὅλοι τοῦ ὑπωμόσασιν # δοῦλοι του ν' ἀποθάνουν. (3) (CoM H 1441)

Lurier (1964: 110): “all swore to him that they would die his slaves”

cf. ὅλοι γὰρ τοῦ ὠμόσασιν # δοῦλοι του ν' ἀποθάνουν. (4) (CoM P1441)

Although I have excluded them from my statistics because of their supposed deviant stress pattern (cf. supra 4.2.3.1), the parallel pairs with the auxiliary ἔχω are quite interesting with regard to the future formation in LMG, for instance:

(28) νὰ πολεμήσῃ μετ' αὐτόν, # νὰ τὸν ἔχῃ ἐξαλείψει (10) (CoM H 5991)

Lurier (1964: 243): “to give him battle and destroy him”

cf. νὰ πολεμήσῃ μετ' αὐτόν # καὶ νὰ τὸν ἐξαλείψῃ (11) (CoM P 5991)

The periphrastic νά + ἔχω + infinitive (H) alternates with νά + subjunctive (P). The latter is generally said to constitute the more modern future construction, since the infinitive disappears during the Middle Ages (Joseph 1983; Browning 1999<sup>2</sup>: 79). The principal replacement of ἔχω + infinitive, though, is a periphrasis with θέλω (+ infinitive or + νά), which eventually results in the Modern Greek future particle θα (Browning 1999<sup>2</sup>: 79; Markopoulos 2009a). It is thus obvious that “the formation of the future was in a state of flux” in LMG (Browning 1999<sup>2</sup>: 79).

As noted, the use of synonyms, especially of common verbs, is also a very popular way to adjust to the metrical structure. In the next example, κράζω corresponds with λαλέω.<sup>51</sup>

(29) Ὁ δοῦκας γὰρ τὸν ἔκραξε # ἐκεῖνον τὸν Ρουμπέρτον (5) (CoM H 2182)<sup>52</sup>

Lurier (1964: 135): “Then the doge called Robert to him”

---

<sup>50</sup> Note, however, that this distinction will become geographically determined: the genitive is typical of Standard Modern Greek and the southern dialects, while the northern dialects prefer the accusative (Manolessou & Stamatis 2006); cf. supra 1.1.1.2.1.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. CoM H 4986.

<sup>52</sup> This is an example of topic right-dislocation; cf. infra 5.2.3.2.4.

cf. Ὁ δοῦκας τὸν ἐλάλησεν # ἐκεῖνον τὸν Ρουμπέρτον (4) (CoM P 2182)

In the following pair, the verb ἀφηγέομαι corresponds with δείκνυμι:

(30) λεπτῶς τοὺς ἀφηγήσετον # τοῦ πρίγκιπος Μορέως (3) (CoM H 6363)

Lurier (1964: 254): “in detail he told them about the prince of Morea”

cf. λεπτομερῶς τοὺς ἔδειξεν # τοῦ πρίγκιπος τοὺς λόγους (5) (CoM P 6363)

In many examples, the different syllabic position can simply be ascribed to a different ordering of constituents:<sup>53</sup>

(31) οὐδὲν τὸ ἐστεργήθησαν # νὰ τὸ ποιήσουν οὕτως (10) (CoM H 6686)

Lurier (1964: 262): “[others] did not approve of their acting in this way”

cf. οὐδὲ ποσῶς τὸ ἔστρεξαν # οὕτως νὰ τὸ ποιήσουν (12) (CoM P 6686)

(32) σκοπῶντα καὶ λογίζοντα, # τοῦ νὰ τοὺς ἔχη δούλους (11) (CoM H 2266)

Lurier (1964: 137): “assuming and believing that he had them as vassals”

cf. σκοπῶντας καὶ λογίζοντας # δούλους του νὰ τοὺς ἔχη (13) (CoM P 2266)

Another recurring phenomenon is the use of a weakly used, so-called light verb and a direct object which represents the actual content, that is to say βουλήν in the next example, instead of a normal verb such as συμβουλεύω (cf. infra 5.2.2):<sup>54</sup>

(33) κράζει τοὺς κεφαλᾶδες του # βουλήν νὰ τοῦ ἔχουν δώσει (12) (CoM H 2627)

Lurier (1964: 148): “[the prince] called his captains to give him counsel”

cf. λαλεῖ τοὺς κεφαλᾶδες του # ὡς νὰ τὸν συμβουλέψουν (11) (CoM P 2627)

Note that this example also contains morphological differences, namely with regard to the case of the OCP and with regard to the future formation.

In the following example, we find both phonological and morphological differences. In P, the OCP takes a different case: instead of the genitive τοῦ the accusative τόν is used, by which an elision with ἐχάρισεν is made impossible. As such, the absence of the one syllabic γάρ, is “compensated”:

---

<sup>53</sup> Cf. CoM H 7572.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. CoM H 3115, 9114.



(34) Κ' ἐκεῖνος γὰρ τοῦ ἐχάρισεν # τὸ δμάτζιο καὶ λιζίαν (5) (CoM H 3185)

Lurier (1964: 166): “and he granted him the homage and liegdom”

cf. κ' ἐκεῖνος τὸν ἐχάρισεν # δμάτζιο καὶ λιζίαν (4) (CoM P 3185)

Contrary to H, there is no elision between the OCP and the verb in P, yet the latter manuscript does also not contain the prefix ἐν-:

(35) τὴν ἀνθρωπέαν καὶ τὴν στρατείαν, # τόσον νὰ τοῦ ἐνεμείνη (12) (CoM H 1646)

Lurier (1964: 116): “the homage and the military service consonant with this rank, so much would remain to him”

cf. τὴν ἀνθρωπίαν καὶ τὴν στρατείαν # τόσην τὸ νὰ τοῦ μένη (13) (CoM P 1646)

In the following pair, a phonological difference is combined with a lexical one: in contrast to the hiatus in H, in P elision takes place between the OCP and the verb δηλώω, which constitutes a synonym of ἀφηγέομαι:

(36) Λεπτῶς τὰ ἀφηγήσετον # τοῦ Σεβαστοκρατόρου (3) (CoM H 3809)

Lurier (1964: 183f.): “In detail he related to the sebastokrator”

cf. Λεπτομερῶς τὰ ἐδήλωσεν # τοῦ Σεβαστοκρατόρου (5) (CoM P 3809)

In our last preverbal example, phonological, morphological and lexical differences co-exist: in P we find another synonym of ἀφηγέομαι, namely λέγω (εἶπασιν). In H elision takes place between the genitive OCP τοῦ and ἀφηγήθησαν, whereas in P elision is prevented by the accusative OCP τόν. P satisfies the required number of eight syllables thanks to the addition of the particle δέ:

(37) Τὸ πρᾶγμα τοῦ ἀφηγήθησαν # καὶ τὴν δημηγερσίαν (4) (CoM H 8337)

Lurier (1964: 304): “They explained the affair to him and the treachery”

cf. Τὸ πρᾶγμα δὲ τὸν εἶπασιν # καὶ τὴν δημηγερσίαν (5) (CoM P 8337)

### *Postverbal OCPs*

Instead of preverbal ones, the following examples all contain postverbal OCPs which occur at a different syllabic position in the two manuscripts. In P, which does not contain the coordinator καί, there is no synizesis of χολιαστικά:

(38) καὶ λέγει τον χολιαστικά• # Ἦτον καλὸν τὸ ἐποῖκες; (4) (CoM H 3879)

Lurier (1964: 186): “and he said to him in anger: ‘Was that a good thing that you did?’”

cf. λέγει του χολιαστικά• # Ἦτον καλὸ τὸ ἐποῖκες; (3) (CoM P 3879)

In the next pair, the verb καταδουλόω in P corresponds with the paraphrase ἔχω εἰς θέλημαν in H. Καταδουλόω has a stronger meaning, but in general shares the same semantics with ἔχω εἰς θέλημαν:

(39) <ε>δούλωσε τὰ Σκλάβικα # κ' εἶχεν τα εἰς θέλημάν του (11) (CoM H 3040)

Lurier (1964: 161): “he subdued the lands of the Slavs and had them under his will”

cf. ἐδούλωσεν τὰ Σκλαβικὰ # κ' ἐκατεδούλωσέ τα (15) (CoM P 3040)

The following pair involves a difference in word order:

(40) τὸν ρῆγαν τοῦ Σαλονικίου, # νὰ τοῦ ποιήσῃ ὁμάντζιο (10) (CoM H 3423)

Lurier (1964: 173): “the king of Salonika, that he should do him homage”

cf. τὸν ρῆγα Σαλονίκης δέ, # ὁμάντζιο νὰ τοῦ ποίσῃ (13) (CoM P 3423)

In the following example, we find both phonological and morphological differences: no elision takes place in P, while του εἰς is subject to elision in H. Moreover, P contains the singular εἰπέ rather than εἰπέτε and uses the accusative OCP instead of the genitive, like in H:

(41) εἰπέτε του εἰς πληροφορίαν # ἄς τὸ κρατῇ εἰς ἀλήθειον (CoM H 8395)

Lurier (1964: 305): “tell him as information that he may hold to be true”

cf. εἰπέ τον εἰς πληροφορία # νὰ τὸ κρατῇ στερέα (CoM P 8395)

Although less eye-catching, some differences between the two versions must be considered from a phonological perspective. In the next example, elision takes place twice in H (between του and ἀπό and between ἀπό and ἐμέναν). This phonological “intervention” is not necessary in P since it has two fewer syllables: we find the imperative πέτε, which constitutes the shorter variant of εἰπέτε (loss of the initial syllable). Furthermore, P has μένα, which constitutes the shorter variant of the strong personal pronoun ἐμέναν (Lendari 2007: 107; cf. supra 1.1.1.2.1):

(42) “Ἀμέτε εἰς τὸν πρίγκιπα # κ' εἰπέτε του ἀπὸ ἐμέναν (12) (CoM H 3799)

Lurier (1964: 183): “Go to the prince and tell him for me [to come here immediately]”

cf. “Σύρετε εἰς τὸν πρίγκιπαν # πέτε τον ἀπὸ μένα (11) (CoM P 3799)

In the following instance, a phonological difference is found in combination with a lexical one: P has the verb ὑπῆγαν instead of its synonym ἀπόστειλαν and the modern contraction στόν is split up into its former parts εἰς and τόν (cf. supra 4.1.1.2):

(43) κι ἀπόστειλάν τον στὸν Μορέαν # ἐκεῖ εἰς τὴν Ἀνδραβίδα (5) (CoM H 8849)  
Lurier (1964: 316): “and sent him to Morea, to Andravida”

cf. κ’ ὑπῆγαν τον εἰς τὸν Μορέαν # ἐκεῖ εἰς τὴν Ἀνδραβίδα (4) (CoM P 8849)

We will see that in our fourth and final category phonological variation plays an even more important role.

#### 4.2.3.5 Same preverbal trigger; different position

In this last category, I have collected the examples which constitute the most decisive proof that the position of OCPs is not influenced by metrical constraints. As mentioned above (cf. *supra* 4.2.1.2.4), the force of attraction of preferential words and especially of ad hoc emphasised constituents is less strong than that of function words. That is why I have called it an *optional* pragmatic principle. In some parallel pairs in the *Chronicle of Morea*, we find a preverbal OCP in one manuscript, while in the other the OCP appears after the verb despite the presence of the *same* preverbal preferential word/ad hoc emphasised constituent. The following two examples provide such contrastive pairs:

(44) ἐκεῖ ἐπολεμοῦσαν τὸν # οἱ Τοῦρκοι κ’ οἱ Ρωμαῖοι. (CoM H 1300)  
Lurier (1964: 105): “and there the Turks and Romans attacked him”

cf. ἐκεῖ τὸν ἐπολέμησαν # οἱ Τοῦρκοι κ’ οἱ Ρωμαῖοι. (CoM P 1300)

(45) τὸ σώσει τὸ ἐπολέμησαν, # ἀπὸ σπαθίου τὸ ἀπῆραν (CoM H 1713)  
Lurier (1964: 119): “arriving before it, they attacked it and took it by sword”

cf. τὸ σώσει ἐπολεμήσαν τὸ, # ἀπὸ σπαθὶ τὸ ἐπῆραν (CoM P 1713)

Apparently, the poets alternate without problem between preverbal and postverbal OCPs. With the phrase “without problem” I point to the fact that the metrical structure remains correct, whether the OCP appears postverbal or preverbal. An important means of fitting the metrical structure which recurs in the above examples is the possibility of changing the stress of the verb: ἐπολεμοῦσαν-ἐπολέμησαν and ἐπολέμησαν-ἐπολεμήσαν. The stress of the verb also slightly differs in the next two examples (ἐκατηγόρησάν vs. ἐκατηγορήσαν and ἐπληροφορέσαν vs. ἐπληροφόρησαν):

(46) τοῦ κόσμου ὅλου οἱ ἄπαντες # ἐκατηγόρησάν τον. (CoM H 83)  
Lurier (1964: 69): “all the men of the world censured him”

cf. ὅλοι τοῦ κόσμου οἱ ἄνθρωποι # τὸν ἐκατηγορήσαν. (CoM P 83)

(47) Κ' ἐκεῖνοι ὅπου τὸ ἐξεύρασιν # τὸν ἐπληροφόρεσαν (CoM H 7179)

Lurier (1964: 273): “And those who knew informed him”

cf. Κ' ἐκεῖνοι ὅπου ἤξευραν # ἐπληροφόρησάν τον (CoM P 7179)

As mentioned, the *Chronicle of Morea* sometimes foreshadows the development towards proclisis (cf. supra 4.2.2.2.2). This seems also the case in the two above examples, as purely *enclitic* OCPs would be avoided immediately after the caesura, which can be compared with a breathing pause (cf. infra 5.1). Pappas (2004: 78f.) stresses the accentual “optionality”: “These verb-forms were interchangeable (...) the poet was able to manipulate the accenting of the verb in order to keep the pronoun preverbal”. By way of conclusion, consider the summarising table:

Table 2 Types of differences between H and P

Type of difference?	Total of metrically correct half-verses with a significant difference between H and P: 263
1. Structural difference; different position	42
2. Similar preverbal trigger; same position	110
3. Same (lack) of preverbal trigger; different syllabic position	102
4. Same preverbal trigger; different position	9

In sum, the comparison of the two parallel manuscripts of the *Chronicle of Morea* has revealed so much variation in all grammatical domains that the poet could hardly have felt constrained by the verse structure.<sup>55</sup> By now it should have become clear that *metri causa* is not a valuable argument to explain the position of an OCP: if the poet had wanted the reverse order, the many available alternatives would have enabled him to place the OCP in preverbal instead of postverbal position and vice versa.

In general, we can conclude that the πολιτικός στίχος is a metre which provides such a high degree of flexibility and naturalness that the poet could almost freely choose the formulation that he wanted, or better: a formulation that was correct according to the LMG grammar. In other words, we are now able to contradict Eideneier's (1983b: 236) extreme statement that “Die poetische Syntax geht vor der grammatischen Syntax”.

<sup>55</sup> For still more examples which testify to the enormous flexibility which the πολιτικός στίχος metre allows, I refer to Soltic (2013a).

## Chapter 5 Core analysis

Now that we are acquainted with the – natural and flexible – nature of the πολιτικός στίχος, we can finally pass on to my actual analysis, which constitutes the core of my dissertation: in what follows, I will apply the concepts of the IU (5.1), the topic/focus pair (5.2) and of DMs (5.3) to the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry and demonstrate that these applications lead to fuller insights into its language, metre and discourse.

### 5.1 Intonation/Information unit

*“It seems probable that the oral poet or singer does not start to compose a verse with a pattern of fifteen syllables in his mind. Rather, he builds it up in stages” (Mackridge 1990b: 205)<sup>1</sup>*

#### 5.1.1 Introduction: the pointlessness of the concept “sentence”

When reading LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry, it attracts attention that the concept “sentence” does not make much sense, as the following passage clearly shows:

- (1) καὶ παρευθὺς ἐγύρισεν # ἀπὸ τοσοῦτον ὕψος  
“and immediately he descended from such a height”  
κ’ ἔπεσεν μὲ τὸ ταίριν <του> # καὶ εὐρέθην φονεμένον.

---

<sup>1</sup> Mackridge, however, does not refer here to IUs, but to what he calls “metrical words”.

“and he fell with his pall and he was found dead.”

Καὶ εἶδα καὶ ἐξενίσθην το # καὶ μέριμνα μὲ ἐσέβην (LR 145-147)

“And I saw it and was amazed at it and sorrow came upon me”

The insertion of a full stop is an arbitrary affair: the concept “sentence” – a written-based concept – becomes useless, as Bakker (1999: 41) has noted with regard to the Homeric epics: “Instead of sentential arrangements, we see a relation of addition between units” (cf. *supra* 2.3.3). And just as Bakker has demonstrated with regard to the Homeric epics, I am convinced that the principle of (stylised) IUs basically applies to my corpus as well: we should rather conceive these texts as a concatenation of IUs. As a matter of fact, the need of a unit of speech for an analysis of the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry has already been pointed to by Eideneier (1989a: 180): “Es ist ja nicht zu verkennen, daß auch Texte im einfachen Erzählstil rhythmischen Gegebenheiten der Spracher unterliegen”.<sup>2</sup>

In what follows, I will argue that not only that the end of each verse constitutes a breathing pause – which is fairly evident – but also that the fixed caesura at the eighth syllable implies an IU boundary. The fixed caesura is thus not only a metrical boundary but a prosodic boundary as well. Accordingly, we can compare the two standard half-verses of respectively eight and seven syllables with two (stylised) IUs. From this perspective, the two standard half-verses of each πολιτικὸς στίχος are not merely metrical units, but also cognitive units. Apparently, Eideneier (1999: 104) also thought of the caesura as the boundary between the “rhythmischen Gegebenheiten der Spracher”:

“Wenn wir von einem menschlichen Atemvolumen für den Vortrag von Versen zwischen 12 und 17 Silben ausgehen (...) ist eine solche Mittelzäsur eine zusätzliche Möglichkeit zur Sinn-gliederung und Pausenmarkierung”

In order to justify this hypothesis, I will appeal to metrical (5.1.2) and syntactico-semantic (5.1.3) arguments. The latter category is the largest one: it will deal with the tendency of each half-verse to correspond to a grammatical sense-unit (5.1.3.1); the distribution of P2 particles (5.1.3.2), afterthoughts (5.1.3.3), the coordinator καί (5.1.3.4) and vocatives (5.1.3.5).<sup>3</sup> Finally, I will also touch upon the possibility of a slightly

---

<sup>2</sup> With regard to Ancient Greek, Slings has already applied the concept to the historian Herodotos (Slings 2002) and the lyric poet Bacchylides (Slings 1999), which – unexpectedly – have preserved echoes of a spoken discourse. Furthermore, very recently, Scheppers (2011: 40) has adopted the IU to Platonic dialogues and Lysian orations in the monograph “The Colon Hypothesis”.

<sup>3</sup> For a shorter version of this argumentation, see Soltic (2014a).

different articulation into IUs, i.e. threefolders instead of a binary division into IUs (5.1.4).

### 5.1.2 Metrical arguments

To begin with, the correspondence between a standard metrical unit and an information unit seems not at all exceptional with regard to medieval “oral” poetry:

“Among oral narrative forms of the Middle Ages, the most rigorously paratactic are the verse genres composed formulaically in performance. Here parataxis is the result of prosodic constraints and the desirability, for both the poet and audience, of *having information blocks correspond to metrically regular units*” (Fleischman 1985: 876; fn 32; my italics)

However, to be perfectly clear, I do not want to pronounce upon the *medium* of the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry, contrary to what Fleischman does with regard to the Old French poetry: the discussion below should not be read as an argument in favour of an actual oral performance (cf. supra 1.1.2.5.1.1). All I assert is that the underlying *conception* of the texts is an articulation in IUs.

By far the most important “metrical” argument why the so-called strong caesura (Horrocks 2010<sup>2</sup>: 328) implies a breathing pause is the fact that elision is avoided between the eighth and the ninth syllable, whereas it is allowed elsewhere (Apostolopoulos 1984: 211).<sup>4</sup> I have conducted a check in three romances (*Achilleïs Byzantina*; *Velthandros & Chrysandza*; *Livistros & Rodamni*) and, indeed, in 96% (553/575) of the verses in which a vowel immediately precedes and immediately follows the caesura elision is avoided, for instance:<sup>5</sup>

- (2) ἐκεῖνος πάλιν κείται # ἄψυχος, νεκρωμένος. (LR 3539)  
“he again lies down, lifeless, dead”

The opposite of elision, i.e. hiatus, occurs between the vowels of the eighth (αι) and the ninth (α) syllable. While the presence of elision seems to exclude the possibility of a breathing pause, hiatus is a signal of discontinuous speech and thus of a possible breathing pause.

---

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Lendari (2007: 132); cf. supra 4.1.1.1.

<sup>5</sup> On a total of 7299 verses, the distinction hiatus/elision is not applicable in 6724 instances, since two consonants or one consonant and one vowel are found at the caesura.

Of the fifteen syllables of the πολιτικός στίχος, of which in principle only the even ones can be stressed, the first and ninth syllable may occasionally carry an accent as well (Apostolopoulos 1984: 214). Since the ninth is the first syllable following the caesura, this suggests a possible identical beginning of the two half-verses:

- (3) Εἶχε μεγάλην δύναμιν, # εἶχε μεγάλην φρόνα (BT 8)  
 “He had great power, he had great insight”

This is also suggested by Chila-Markopoulou (2004: 204): “In my opinion, the position after the caesura could be regarded as a kind of ‘initial’ position”.

Furthermore, the interpretation of the two standard half-verses as two IUs is supported by the presumable composite origin of the πολιτικός στίχος: it is derived from an octosyllabic and a heptasyllabic metre (Lauxtermann 1999: 18).

### 5.1.3 Syntactico-semantic arguments

#### 5.1.3.1 Grammatical sense-unit

Another argument in favour of an interpretation of the πολιτικός στίχος into two IUs is its straightforward syntactic structure. Each verse constitutes a grammatical sense-unit: “le premier principe est l’accord entre le contenu et la forme, le vers et l’idée” (Marboeuf 2009: 46). As such, a strong enjambment is rare between two successive verses (Kyriakidis 1990: 258ff.).<sup>6</sup> Now, a strong enjambment also hardly occurs between the two standard *half-verses* (Lendari 2007: 132; Politis 2010: 152).<sup>7</sup> Most half-verses thus represent an independent, autonomous entity, i.e. a syntactic unit by itself: “each half-line comprises a self-contained unit, in terms of syntax and sense (...) As a general rule, a line of political verse consists of two units” (Beaton 1980: 44). Predominantly, this short unit is a clause or a phrase, for instance:<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup> With “strong” enjambment, I especially refer to the separation between a prenominal adjective and its noun.

<sup>7</sup> However, we need to have a more explicit account of “the types of syntactical structure that may be interrupted at the midline caesura and at the end of a line” (Mackridge 1990b: 202).

<sup>8</sup> A counterexample, in which the half-verses do not form independent entities, constitutes the following verse:

- (1) καὶ ἤρρεν τὴν ἀπὸ καλοῦ # φίλου του συνεργίαν (LR 3589)  
 “and he found her with the assistance of his good friend”

The prepositional phrase ἀπὸ καλοῦ φίλου του is interrupted by the caesura (cf. Lendari 2007: 132).



- (4) τὸ κάλλος τοῦ προσώπου της # καὶ τὸ κορμὶν της ὅλον (VC 613)  
 “the beauty of her face and her whole body”
- (5) καταφιλοῦσα τὸν υἱὸν # καὶ ταῖς χερσὶν κρατοῦσα (AB 106)  
 “she kisses her son and she holds (him) in her arms”

This observation corresponds to the numerous inquiries which seek the “grammatical equivalent” of the IU in various modern languages (cf. *supra* 2.3.3). And just like the IUs in modern spoken languages, the two half-verses each exhibit simple syntax: the half-verses in my corpus hardly ever consist of sophisticated compound sentences.

Interestingly, the formulaic phrases of the πολιτικὸς στίχος (cf. *supra* 1.1.2.2.1), which are traditionally defined as “prefabricated sense-blocks”, typically cover one half-verse: “the formula must fill either the first or the second half of the political line (...) It must be either eight or seven syllables long respectively” (M. Jeffreys 1973: 175).<sup>9</sup>

The fact that the caesura divides the verse into two “nice” syntactico-semantic units is sometimes reflected by the script image, both in the authentic manuscripts and in the modern editions. Some scribes copying πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry not only indicate the verse-end, but also the fixed caesura (cf. Papathomopoulos & E. Jeffreys 1996; Lendari 2007: 507ff.). Eideneier (1983a: 135) relates this to the oral performance which he believes took place (cf. *supra* 1.1.2.5.1.1):

“Es ist zumindest auffällig, daß in so gut wie allen Handschriften mit byzantinischen Versdichtungen in der Volkssprache sowohl das Versende als auch die Mittelzäsur im Fünfzehnsilber bezeichnet ist, entweder durch stichische Anordnung oder durch Interpunktion, meist sogar durch beides. Diese „Taktstriche“ für den mündlichen Vortrag sind fester Bestandteil der Textüberlieferung. Wären diese Texte über eine Reihe von Jahrhunderten als Lesestoff in schriftlicher Überlieferung gestanden, wäre diese metrische Interpunktion nicht hin und wieder vernachlässigt worden?”

In modern editions too, we often find punctuation marks at the caesura. Nonetheless, it is common knowledge that there exists sometimes a divergence between the segmentation of the discourse into IUs and the conventional punctuation of the texts (Scheppers 2011: 150). Since modern editors are (mis)guided by their knowledge of modern spoken languages, *in se* of their mother tongue, the intuitions of editors cannot serve as trustworthy evidence (Noret 1995; Giannouli 2011: 23).

---

<sup>9</sup> Beaton (1980: 52) speaks of “two formula systems, each the length of a half-line”.

### 5.1.3.2 P2 particles

A more trustworthy syntactic argument in favour of the hypothesis that the two standard half-verses can be compared to IUs is provided by the P2 particles, such as γάρ, γοῦν, δ(έ), μέν and οὔν. As already noted (cf. supra 4.2.2) and as will extensively be discussed in the chapter on DMs (cf. infra 5.3.1), these particles had fallen into disuse in the spoken language, but are still inserted in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry, as prominent archaising features of its so-called mixed language (cf. supra 1.1.1.2.1). Moreover, rather than being inserted at random, they still obey the Law of Wackernagel, of which we have noted that it should be interpreted in a prosodic way rather than in a syntactic one (P2 in IU rather than P2 in syntactic unit, although both often coincide) (cf. supra 4.2.1.2.1). As a consequence, the particles can serve as diagnostic means to identify IUs: we can derive the beginning of a new IU from their position.

As mentioned, 97.5% of the particles in my corpus of eight texts are found in P2 (cf. supra 4.2.2). Eideneier (1989: 190) relates this preference for P2 again to an oral performance: “Vorlesepraxis (...) da die Partikel δέ die Pause eindeutig hörbar macht”. However, what I have not been explicit about, is how I precisely understood this second position. In the first place, the P2 particles of course appear after the first word/constituent in the verse:

- (6) Ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ χρόνος ἀπεδά, # φίλοι καὶ συγγενεῖς μου (LR 2186)

“For the time has now come, my friends and relatives”

- (7) Ὡς οὔν ταῦτα πεπλήρωντο, # ἰδοὺ Ἔρως πτερωμένος (VC 662)

“Now when these things had been finished, look, a winged Eros!”

- (8) ἀντάμα γὰρ ἐσφάζονταν, # διχῶς ἐλεημοσύνης. (BT 917)

“for together they were slaughtered, without pity”

More revealingly, though, the particles also occur after the first word/constituent *following the caesura*, albeit less frequently:

- (9) υἱὸς δευτεροτόκος # ὁ Βέλθανδρος γὰρ ἦτον (VC 9)

“the second born son was Velthandros”

- (10) ἡμᾶς αὐθέντης πέφυκεν, # σὸς δὲ υἱὸς τυγχάνει (AB 164)

“he is our natural leader, he happens to be your son”

Both placements can of course co-occur:

(11) ἔλεγον δέ τὰ γράμματα, # ἔφασκον δέ τοιάδε (VC 383)

“the letters spoke, they told the following”

(12) οἱ μὲν εἰς στύλους τὸ ἔκοπταν, # οἱ δέ καὶ εἰς τὰ σκουτάρια (AB 724)

“some hit the columns, others the shields”

(13) εἰς αὐτὸν δέ παρηγοριὰ # οὐδόλως γὰρ οὐκ ἦτον (PP 296)

“yet no consolation came to him, not at all”

This results in the following statistics:<sup>10</sup>

Table 3 Distribution of P2 particles γάρ, γοῦν, δ(έ), μέν and οὔν

Total of P2 particles γάρ, γοῦν, δ(έ), μέν and οὔν: 2224	
P2: 2169 (97.5%)	first half-verse: 1878 (84.4%)
	second half-verse: 291 (13.1%)
Not P2: 55 (2.5%)	first half-verse: 42 (1.9%)
	second half-verse: 13 (0.6%)

The distribution of the particles – more precisely: the fact that they occur in P2 not only in the first half-verse, but also in the *second* half-verse – shows that the fixed caesura ushers in a new IU.

In this context, the work by Loudová (2007 & 2009b), one of the few scholars who has examined the particles in LMG, should be mentioned (cf. *infra* 5.3.2.1). Loudová has identified the rhythmical function of the P2 particles with regard to the Early Medieval Greek chronicles (e.g. 6<sup>th</sup> c. Malalas). She explicitly relates the position of the particles to “rhythmical boundaries”:

“I would like to point out one more function of the particles, which is linked closely with their ability to distinguish the *discourse boundaries*. It seems that thanks to it the particles ensured *rhythmical segmentation of the texts intended for recitation* (...) This way we can at least partly explain apparent abundance of the particles in the narrative texts where the particles separating the phrasal units occasionally do not even take into consideration sentence syntactic articulation. They served presumably not only as text dividing means while reading but also *during the recitation they indicated pauses*” (Loudová 2007: 7; my italics)

<sup>10</sup> For the precise distribution pattern of the P2 particles among the specific texts of my corpus, see *infra* 5.3.1.2.1.

Loudová thus acknowledges two different functions of P2 particles, namely signalling discourse boundaries as well as indicating recitation pauses, but she does not draw the logical conclusion that both functions coincide in the concept of the IU (boundary), which is both an information unit and an intonation unit.

### 5.1.3.3 Afterthoughts

Another argument for the interpretation of the caesura in terms of an IU boundary is furnished by the position of so-called afterthoughts, a phenomenon which has largely remained unnoticed and which I will thus elaborate.<sup>11</sup> I will distinguish between corrective afterthoughts and “normal” ones.

Let me begin with the corrective afterthoughts. In principle, verbs must agree with their subjects in person (first, second or third) and number (singular or plural) in Greek. Normally, they do so in my corpus as well. In some instances, however, the verbal ending does not show morphological agreement with its subject: the verb remains singular, although either an additional subject or a multiple subject as a whole is added.<sup>12</sup>

Before turning to the examples, two remarks are in order. First, it should be noted that the lack of verbal agreement is not always evident in my English translation, for English possesses fewer morphological distinctions than Greek, for instance: the third person singular [sg] (e.g. “(I) speak/spoke”) is identical to the third person plural (e.g. “(they) speak/spoke”). Certainly with regard to the subjects added as whole, it is difficult to render the Greek faithfully, since English requires that the subject is explicitly expressed. Indeed, as opposed to English, Greek is a so-called pro-drop language: it is not necessary to explicitly express the subject (Pappas 2004: 56). I have attempted to solve this inconvenience a (provisional) pronoun in my translation between square brackets. Secondly, I want to emphasise that I have of course verified the critical apparatus with regard to all the below mentioned examples so as to ensure that the lack of grammatical agreement is not from the pen of the editor(s). However, it is rather unlikely that the editions are unreliable in this respect. As a matter of fact, the

---

<sup>11</sup> Note that the linguistic terminology is diffuse for this kind of constructions: “antitopic”, “right-dislocation”, “detachment”, “tail” and doubtless other terms I am not aware of (Lambrecht 1981: 75; Bakker 1990a: 11; fn 33).

<sup>12</sup> Another construction which can also be considered among the corrective afterthoughts is the repair right-dislocation. Since this construction involves coreferential OCPs, it will be discussed under the types of clitic doubling; cf. *infra* 5.2.3.4.2.

opposite is much more plausible, namely that editors have “corrected” the agreement mistakes and that more examples of corrective afterthoughts are thus to be found in the manuscripts.

Let me begin by citing some verses in which an extra subject is added to a preverbal subject:

- (14) καὶ ὁ Ἀχιλλεὺς ἐθαύμασεν # καὶ οἱ δώδεκά του ἀγοῦροι (AB 578)  
“and Achilles was surprised and his twelve youngsters”

According to strict written norms, we would have expected a plural verb ἐθαύμασαν, which corresponds to the singular ἐθαύμασεν as regards number of syllables and stress pattern and thus has the same metrical value. We might even come across a different word order in a writtenly conceived text: “the leader Aeneas and all the nobles came”.<sup>13</sup> Consider a few more similar examples:

- (15) καὶ ὁ πενθερός του ἐγέλασεν # καὶ πάντες οἱ θεωροῦντες (AB 1540)  
“and his father-in-law laughed [sg] and all the spectators”

- (16) ὁ Ἀπόλλων τοῦ τὸ ἔταξε # καὶ οἱ θεοὶ τοὺς ὅλοι. (BT 11183)  
“Apollo did [sg] it for him and all their gods”

An extra subject can also be appended to a postverbal subject:

- (17) Ἀπεχαιρέτησεν ὁ Ἀχιλλεὺς # καὶ ὅλον τὸ φουσάτον (AB 383)  
“Achilles saluted [sg] and the whole army”

- (18) Καβαλικεύει ὁ Βέλθανδρος # καὶ τὰ παιδόπουλά του (VC 767)  
“Velthandros rides horseback and his youngsters”

- (19) ὥς εἶδε γὰρ ὁ βασιλεὺς # καὶ ἡ δέσποινα Πριάμου (IB 101)  
“for when the king had [sg] seen it and the wife of Priam”

- (20) ἔπεσεν ἡ κατοῦνα του # καὶ οἱ παραταγές του (LR 2077)  
“his camp fell [sg] and his sections”

---

<sup>13</sup> Consider the following comparable instances, in which a nominal direct object is added to an OCP. However, this does of course not result in a lack of verbal agreement:

- (2) χιλίους νὰ τοὺς ἐσκότωσαν # καὶ πλεωτέρους τότε. (BT 9230)  
“thousands they killed, and then even more”  
(3) Εἰς φυλακὴν τὸν ἔβαλαν # καὶ πάντα τὸν λαόν του. (BT 13821)  
“They threw him in jail and all his people”

(21) ἦλθεν ὁ δοῦξ ὁ Αἰνεῶς # καὶ πάντες μεγιστᾶνοι. (BT 11491)  
“the leader Aeneas came [sg] and all the nobles”

A composite subject can also as a whole be adjoined and result in a lack of verbal agreement:

(22) πῶς ἔπαθεν ἐκ τὰς ἀρχὰς # ἐκείνη καὶ ὁ Ἰμπερίας. (IM 848)  
“how [she] suffered from the beginning, she and Imberios”

(23) καὶ ἀναστενάζει ἀπὸ ψυχῆς # ἐκείνη καὶ ὁ ρήγας. (IM 864)  
“and [she] complains from her soul, she and the king”

(24) διὰ νὰ ὑπάγῃ μετ’ αὐτὰ # ἐκεῖνος καὶ ὁ λαός του. (BT 12908)  
“so that [he] would set off with them (the ships), he and his people”

(25) ν’ ἀπόθανεν εἰς φυλακὴν # ἐκεῖνος κ’ οἱ ἐδικοί του (CoM H 4464)  
“so that [he] would die in prison, he and his fellows”

In sum, it seems that the poet has already pronounced the verb (in singular) before realising its subject is actually multiple. However, not being in the possibility of rewriting – or at least attempting to give that impression –, he correctively adds (a part of) the subject, often making use of the popular coordinator καί (cf. infra 5.1.3.4). Note that this added subject often involves the demonstrative pronoun ἐκεῖνος. Demonstratives distinguish certain entities from others and thus clearly exert a clarifying role in discourse.

Let me now pass to the “normal” afterthoughts, which do not involve a lack of verbal agreement. A common construction which can be considered among the afterthoughts is the apposition, i.e. a (pro)noun is reformulated by a more concrete (“identificatory”) or a synonymous (“reformulative”) expression that takes the same case (cf. Anaxagorou 1998: 139). Usually, it is the subject which is clarified by means of an apposition:

(26) Σουλτάνος τὸν ἀγόρασεν, # τοῦ Καῖριοῦ αὐθέντης (IM 567; cf. 624)  
“A sultan bought him, the leader of Cairo”

(27) μανθάνει το ὁ βασιλεὺς # τοῦ Πάρι ὁ πατέρας (IB 764)  
“The king learned it, the father of Paris”

(28) Τὰ δύο ἐνεθράφησαν, # τ’ ἀρσενικὸν κ’ ἡ κόρη (PP 144)  
“The two were raised, the boy and the girl”

Again, this construction is often accompanied by the demonstrative pronoun ἐκεῖνος:

(29) Καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τὸν ἔλεγεν # ἐκεῖνος ὁ πατήρ του (AB 333)

“And the king told him, that father of him”

(30) Καὶ εὐθὺς ὁ ἔρων λέγει με, # ἐκεῖνος ὁ ἐδικός μου (LR 409)

“And immediately the eros spoke to me, the one of me”

However, appositions are not at all limited to constituents with the grammatical role of subject:

(31) Κλίνει τῶν δῶν τὰς κεφαλὰς, # γαβροῦ καὶ θυγατρὸς του (AB 1528)

“He bowed the heads of the two, of his son-in-law and daughter”

(32) Τὸν Ἀλκείον παρακαλεῖ, # τὸν βασιλέα ἐκεῖνον (BT 13861)

“He begged Alkaios, that king”

(33) ἀπὸ τὴν κόρην, ἤξευρε, # ταύτην τὴν Ἑρμιόνην. (BT 13583)

“with the girl, know, that Hermione”

(34) Ἴδόντες δὲ τὸ θέαμα, # τὴν ἀπειλὴν ἐκείνην (AB 630)

“Seeing the scene, that threat”

(35) Ἀκούσας ταῦτα ὁ πατήρ # τοὺς λόγους τῶν ἀρχόντων (AB 167)

“After the father had heard this, the words of the archonts”

(36) μήτηρ αὐτὴν ἐγέννησεν # κόρην τὴν ΠλάτZIA Φλώρα (PP 1125)

“a mother gave birth to her, the girl Platzia Phlora”

(37) υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν δεῦτερον # τοῦ ἄνακτος ἐκείνου (VC 1259)

“the second son of him, of that leader”

(38) ἦτον καὶ εἰς τὴν χώραν τοὺς # τῶν γυναικῶν ἐκείνων (BT 10644)<sup>14</sup>

“she was also in the region of them, of those women”

(39) Ἡὺξήνθη δὲ τὸ κράτος του # τοῦ βασιλέως ἐκείνου (AB 83)

“His power increased, (the power) of that king”

Note again the abundance of the demonstrative pronoun ἐκεῖνος.

Interestingly, Anaxagorou (1998: 139) associates the construction of the apposition with a spoken discourse:

---

<sup>14</sup> Note that these last 2 examples involve a construction related to clitic doubling (topic right-dislocation), for the apposition is actually coreferential with the genitive OCP; cf. *infra* 5.2.3.2.4.

“Another feature of the Chronicle [of Machairas] is apposition, effected through identification and reformulation. Apposition is one of the ways in which the ‘adding style’, associated with orality, expresses itself. The type of apposition in which a word is reformulated with a synonymous one (...) can be seen as a feature of the repetitious nature of speech. This is one of the marked features of the oral story-telling tradition at its best. As for apposition of the identificatory type, found to occur with great frequency in the Chronicle, we get again strong confirmation from linguists that it is a feature associated with spoken discourse”

As a matter of fact, it is elucidating to relate the afterthought construction to our central concept of the IU. In modern linguistics, it has been acknowledged that the class of afterthoughts in general testifies to a spoken discourse (Geluykens 1994: 93).<sup>15</sup> Indeed, since rereading is not possible, the speaker wants to be sure his message is clear enough. In more traditional grammatical approaches, which usually have a written bias, this is often overlooked. In their edition of the *War of Troy*, Papathomopoulos & E. Jeffreys (1996: lxxvi; my italics), for instance, comment: “But this text shows very few of the small-scale anacoloutha and syntactic awkwardnesses (*singular verbs for plural subjects* etc.) that are frequently characteristic of this type of literature”. They presumably refer to the above described phenomenon of corrective afterthoughts involving a lack of verbal agreement.

It might also be worth noting that the afterthought is one of the structures which can also be identified in the modern folk songs, which are nearly always composed in the πολιτικός στίχος (cf. supra 1.1.2.4.2): “τὸ δεύτερον ἡμιστίχιον φαίνεται (...) ἢ προσδιορίζον καλύτερον τὴν ἔννοιαν τοῦ πρώτου” (Kyriakides 1990: 271; Beaton 1980: 44). Peri (2012: 155) almost ridicules this structure:

“Si è detto e ripetuto che la lunghezza del decapentasillabo costringe il poeta – e soprattutto l'improvvisatore popolare, che ha bisogno di tempo per creare il verso successivo – a gonfiare l'enunciato diluendo nel secondo emistichio (mediante supplementi, ripetizioni, sinonimi) l'informazione fornita dal primo emistichio. Al punto che interi brani presentano senso compiuto anche se ci limitiamo a leggere solo la prima colonna di emistichi”

Peri perhaps approaches these constructions too much from a traditional written perspective, for it remains to be seen whether the audience of our πολιτικός στίχος poetry – if there is one, at least<sup>16</sup> – perceives these constructions as “awkward”.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Bakker (1990a: 11); Carter & McCarthy (1997: 81); Spevak (2010: 113).

<sup>16</sup> Cf. supra 1.1.2.5.1.1.



In fact, in light of the adoption of a spoken discourse the corrective afterthoughts in particular become understandable, for in an oral grammar pragmatic requirements often overrule syntactic rules (cf. Slings 1992: 96 & 1994: 411). As for the reason why afterthoughts are typical of orally rather than of writtenly conceived language, the following statement by Nava (2005: 79f.) is revealing:

“They tend to be used to make the listener’s life easier by clarifying aspects of the message (...) The speaker realises that s/he has not given his/her interlocutor enough clues for him/her to identify who is being talked about, so s/he retraces his/her steps and adds the final noun phrase tag”

In a similar vein, Halford (1996: 136) notes that the afterthought construction divides the identification of reference into several steps, which of course facilitates the task for both listener and speaker. Afterthoughts thus serve the pragmatic aim of making the information flow more comfortable.

More concretely, the “steps” to which Halford refers are IUs (cf. *supra* 2.3.2). As a matter of fact, it has been established that afterthoughts are usually accompanied by an IU boundary, namely between the actual thought (the “reparandum” in the words of Geluykens 1994: 182) and the afterthought.<sup>17</sup> This allows the speaker some time to think and to specify – or even to correct “a possibly problematic reference” (Lambrecht 1981) in the case of corrective afterthoughts.<sup>18</sup>

When we now reconsider my examples above, it is noticeable that all afterthoughts are consistently attached immediately after the fixed caesura – they are never inserted *inside* a half-verse. Schematically, this results in the following structures: S + V<sub>sg</sub> # καί S; V<sub>sg</sub> + S # καί S; V<sub>sg</sub> # S καί S and X # X<sub>apposition</sub>. Accordingly, this observation once more strengthens the hypothesis that the caesura implies an IU boundary. This is confirmed by the fact that the above constructions are sometimes “stretched” over the verse ending, which is acknowledged to constitute an IU boundary; I give two examples of a corrective afterthought:

(40) Λοιπόν, ἂν θέλῃς τίποτε # μικρὸν νὰ ἐξανασάνω

“Moreover, if you want that I revive a bit,”

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατέρας σου, # ποίσει μας θέλεις τοῦτο (BT 9856-9857)

“I and your father, you will do that for us”

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Lambrecht (1981: 76 & 86); Valioui (1994: 57); Grosz & Ziv (1998: 297); de Vries (2007: 11); Janse (2008: 170).

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Ziv (1994); Averintseva-Klisch (2008).

- (41) Μίαν ἡμέραν βούλομαι # νὰ ἔβγω εἰς τὸ κυνήγιν,  
 “One day I want to go out hunting,”  
ἐγὼ καὶ ἡ παράξενος ἡ ἑρωτικὴ Ροδάμνη (LR 2308-2309)  
 “I and the extraordinary delicious Rodamni”

As mentioned, in Greek, being a so-called pro-drop language, it is not necessarily to explicitly express the subject. As such, λέγει ὁ Ἀχιλλεύς is ambiguous between “Achilles says” and “he says, Achilles” (cf. Bakker 1990a: 11f.). Hence, we cannot exclude that the following construction in which the subject is added after the caesura might as well present an afterthought:

- (42) φοβοῦνται φόβον δυνατὸν # ὁ Πάρις καὶ ὁ Σελήνιος (IB 296)  
 “they suffered great terror, Paris and Selinios”

It is very plausible that this verse involves an afterthought, for Paris and Selinios have been mentioned two lines above, but the subject of the last plural verb (IB 293: ἐφέραν) involves other persons (employees of the king), so it seems that the poet wants to avoid any confusion. The same applies to this example:

- (43) εἶχεν γυνήν παράξενον # ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς Τροίας (IB 14)  
 “he had an extraordinary wife, the king of Troy”

Priam, the famous king of Troy, has been introduced in the fourth line, yet in the meanwhile our poet mentioned his many sons (IB 8: υἱοὺς πολλοὺς), so that a clarifying afterthought is not overmuch. We can also argue in favour of an afterthought construction with regard to the next examples, which all contain strong personal pronouns:

- (44) καὶ πῶς ἀπεγυμνώθημεν # ἐγὼ καὶ ἡ σύμβιός μου. (VC 1245)  
 “and that we are denuded, I and my spouse”

- (45) καὶ δοῦλοι σου νὰ εἴμεθεν # ἡμεῖς καὶ τὰ παιδία μας. (AB 562)  
 “and we will be your slaves, we and our children”

- (46) Ἐν τούτῳ σὲ ὑποσχίόμεθεν # αὐτοὶ κ' ἐγὼ μετ' αὐτοὺς (CoM H 8966)  
 Lurier (1964: 319): “Therefore, we promise you, they and I with them”

The following two examples without doubt involve an afterthought, since the apposition clarifies the subject of a verb which is interrupted by another clause:

- (47) Οὐ μὴ χαθῇ, ἐγνώριζε, # ἡ γενεὰ Τρωάνα (BT 11719)  
 “It won't be ruined, know, the Trojan descent”

- (48) νὰ γένη ξενοδόχισσα, # ξενοδοχεῖον νὰ βλέπη  
 “that she would become an innkeeper, that she would see an inn”  
 χρόνους, ὥς μέ ’παν, τέσσερεις, # οἱ δαίμονες οἱ πρῶτοι (LR 2747-2748)  
 “for years, so they told me, four in number, the prominent demons”

To conclude this subsection on afterthoughts, we can say that their position provides additional proof for the hypothesis that the fixed caesura implies an IU boundary. Moreover, these afterthoughts are best explained as the result of the *linear* progression of spoken discourse, which runs from one IU to the other or – applied to written texts – from left to right. In this respect, it is significant to note that I have not encountered examples of corrective afterthoughts in which the lack of agreement occurs in the “opposite” direction, i.e. a verb with a plural ending having a singular subject (never  $V_{pl} \# S$ ). Neither have I found examples in which a multiple subject precedes and stands thus at the *left* side of the verb put in singular (never  $S \text{ καί } S \# V_{sg}$ ). We would not expect such constructions in naturally spoken language either.

#### 5.1.3.4 Καί

It might have attracted attention that the additional subjects of the above section are always attached by means of καί.<sup>19</sup> The distribution of καί constitutes another syntactic argument for the thesis that we can compare the two half-verses of the πολιτικός στίχος to two IUs. Καί is extremely frequent in LMG texts (Eideneier 1999; cf. Toufexis & Thoma 2004). My corpus presents no exception in this respect: καί truly abounds. Of course, not all instances of καί can be considered among the same lines. Aerts & Hokwerda (2002: 219ff.), for instance, enumerate no fewer than 15 different functions of καί in the *Chronicle of Morea*.<sup>20</sup> Lurier (1964: 64) even speaks of “the magic καί”. Trenkner (1948: 30) in her turn believes that καί has adopted many functions of the extinct P2 particles (cf. infra 5.3.1). As such, the 14,195 instances of καί in my corpus include both its use as an adverb (“too”) and as a coordinator (“and”).

Interestingly, the abundance of medieval καί has explicitly been related to a spoken discourse (Marboeuf 2009: 57; Trenkner 1948: 61). More precisely, καί has been called “un marqueur de pause”, i.e. “un moyen de rythmer le vers et la phrase (...) sans prendre en considération la composition syntaxique de la phrase” (Marboeuf 2009: 59ff.). Eideneier (1989 & 1999) has elaborated this idea with regard to the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry: he has called coordinating καί the “Auftaktartikel für eine rhythmische

<sup>19</sup> Note that καί can become κι before a vowel (Tonnet 1987: 140).

<sup>20</sup> See Trenkner (1948: 32ff.) for a list of functions of post-classical καί.

Phrase” (Eideneier 1999: 116). Toufexis & Thoma (2004) even explicitly use the term “intonation unit marker” to describe (a part) of the functioning of LMG *καί*. Indeed, *καί* typically opens a new IU.<sup>21</sup> Hence, the exact position of this IU marker can give us clues about IU boundaries.

In conformity with my expectations, *καί* tends to open the two half-verses in my corpus (9190 times = almost 65% of the total): after verse-initial position (5263 instances), post-caesural position is the most popular place for *καί* to occur (3927 instances). This further supports the interpretation of the caesura in terms of an IU boundary. As such, *καί* seems to have adopted the role which the P2 particle *δέ* played in Homeric discourse, namely a simple connector between successive IUs (cf. Trenkner 1948: 30; cf. *supra* 2.3.3). Hence, Anaxagorou (1998: 138) speaks of “the *additive coordinator καί*”. Moreover, in this function, *καί* cannot only be compared to Homeric *δέ* but also to English “and”, which also functions as a maximally neutral linking device (cf. *supra* 2.3.4).

The linkage between successive IUs thus happens in a very linear way in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry, which results in a paratactic organisation. It is well-established that such a simple, paratactic syntax is typical of speaking rather than of writing (cf. *supra* 2.3.4). This has been abundantly noted with regard to other medieval “oral” poetry (Fleischman 1985: 862; Fludernik 1991: 377). With regard to the πολιτικός στίχος poetry too, the preference for parataxis has been noted. Horrocks (2010<sup>2</sup>: 345), for instance, speaks of “the paratactic conventions of popular compositions using the political verse form”. In my corpus, we even find paratactic structures where we would expect hypotactic ones, i.e. a main clause followed by a subordinate clause, for instance:

- (49) *καὶ πῶς ἐτόρμησες, κόρη, # καὶ εἶπες οὐδὲν φοβᾶσαι*  
 “and how you dared, girl, to say that you feared nothing at all”  
*τῶν Ἑρωτων τὰ βάσανα # καὶ τῆς καρδίας τὴν τρῶσιν; (AB 1071-1072)*  
 “the tortures of the Erotes and the wound of the heart?”

- (50) *ἀλλ’ ὅμως ὑποπτεύασιν # καὶ διώκουν τοὺς ἀποπίσω (VC 1100)*  
 “but they nevertheless suspected that they chased after them”

---

<sup>21</sup> An alternative explanation for the high frequency of *καί* (which is not necessarily incompatible with the above interpretation as an IU marker, though) is its interpretation as a prototypical marker of narrativity, going back to the New Testament and popular prose Greek romances like the Alexander romance(s) and the *Life of Aesop* (see Wills 2002 for basic bibliography); cf. Dover (1997: 70ff.); Black (2002: 108ff.).

(51) ὥς ἤκουσε καὶ πνίγηκεν, # ἐθλίβην ἡ ὡραία (VC 1211)

“when she [Chrysandza] heard that she [her maid] drowned, the beautiful girl mourned”

These examples reflect a well-documented construction in Modern Greek – or rather: in *spoken* Modern Greek:

“The syntactical phenomenon parataxis, that is to say the fact that in Modern Greek two sentences may be coordinated by the conjunction καὶ or μὰ, where we would expect a principal sentence with a grammatically subordinated clause, introduced by a conjunction such as νὰ, ὅτι, occurs very frequently in *spoken* Modern Greek. It occurs, in fact, *in the spoken form* of very many languages” (Van Dijk-Wittop Koning 1972: 241; my italics)<sup>22</sup>

The abundance of καί in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος thus clearly reflects a spoken (paratactic) discourse.

#### 5.1.3.5 Vocatives

The position of vocatives provides a final – yet rather tentative – argument in favour of the interpretation that the two standard half-verses can be compared to two IUs.<sup>23</sup> The primary function of vocatives is of course addressing someone, as the term “vocative” betrays. Vocatives express “the speaker’s attempt to capture the hearer’s attention or to direct it to that which is uttered” (Ziv 1985: 191). However, vocatives have also been acknowledged to exert a function of demarcating IUs, i.e. their so-called segmenting function. In that case, vocatives tend to occur *between* two successive IUs. Fraenkel (1965) was the first to note this “Gliedernde Funktion” of vocatives. I cite an example from an oration of Lysias:

Προϊόντος δὲ τοῦ χρόνου, ὦ ἄνδρες, # ἦκον μὲν ἀπροσδοκήτως ἐξ ἀγροῦ (Lysias, *De Caede Eratosthenis* 11.1; Fraenkel 1965: 7)

“Time went on, sirs; I came home unexpectedly from the country”

The vocative ὦ ἄνδρες indeed occurs at the boundary between two successive IUs, as the position of the P2 particles δέ and μὲν confirms. Very recently, Scheppers (2011) has

---

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Mackridge (1985: 241); Egea (1988: 106).

<sup>23</sup> It should not come as a surprise that the vocatives in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος have never been subject to a thorough examination at all. It has only been mentioned that their formal appearance has changed in comparison with Ancient Greek: the vocative case is often replaced by the nominative, with or without the definite article (like in post-Classical Greek) (Lendari 2007: 121).

corroborated Fraenkel's observation. In his corpus, Platonic dialogues and orations of Lysias, all texts which are close to the spoken language, vocatives often occur "on the boundaries of natural IUs", for instance:

- (52) Δεινόν, ὦ Φαῖδρε, # δεινὸν λόγον αὐτός τε ἐκόμισας ἐμέ τε ἠνάγκασας εἰπεῖν (Plato, *Phaedrus* 242d; Fraenkel 1965: 32)  
 "Phaedrus, a dreadful speech it was, a dreadful speech, the one you brought with you, and the one you made me speak"

Thus, the segmenting function constitutes an important secondary function of vocatives.<sup>24</sup> Consequently, we seem able to derive further information on the occurrence of IU boundaries from the position of vocatives.

I have examined the vocatives in three texts of my corpus: *Achilleïs Byzantina*; *Velthandros & Chrysandza* and *Livistros & Rodamni*, totalling 7289 πολιτικοὶ στίχοι and containing no fewer than 532 vocatives. In this sample, vocatives hardly ever occur *inside* a half-verse: in 90% of the cases (475 instances), they are found either immediately before or after the verse-end or immediately before or after the fixed caesura – in other words: nearly always next to a (hypothesised) IU boundary. Vocatives even strongly tend to circle around the caesura (219 precaesural and 88 postcaesural instances), for instance:

- (53) «Δίχα τὸ δίκαιον, φίλε μου, # κανεῖς καλὸν οὐ πράττει (LR 832)  
 "Without justice, my friend, no one does good"
- (54) "Ἄφες τὸ νὰ θυμῶνεσαι, # κερά μου, οὐδὲν ἀρμόζει (LR 1301)  
 "Let your anger go, my mistress, it doesn't suit you"

Thus, the least we can say is that the distribution of vocatives in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry is not inconsistent with the interpretation of the caesura as an IU boundary.

#### 5.1.4 Secondary IU boundary and 3 IUs?

Finally, while the above strongly argues in favour of an interpretation of the πολιτικὸς στίχος into two IUs, I also want to touch upon a possible different division, namely into *three* IUs. The possibility of a secondary caesura ((#)) beside the fixed one has been

---

<sup>24</sup> For another pragmatic function of vocatives which is related to this one, see *infra* 5.3.4.3.

carefully proposed. In their critical edition of Marinos Phalieros, a 15<sup>th</sup> c. author of moralising poems who uses the πολιτικὸς στίχος “with phantasy”, Bakker & van Gemert (1972: 99), for instance, state in very general terms:

“Although the caesura always occurs after the 8th syllable, the verse is often divided in syntactical units which force the reader to make a stop at another point or to read the verse without a pause”

In his grammatical commentary to *Kallimachos & Chrysorroi* (excluded from my corpus, cf. supra 3.3.1.1), Apostolopoulos (1984: 225) is more concrete and speaks of “coupes secondaires”, which seem to occur more often in the (longer) first half-verse:

“Ce qui est à remarquer, c’est que la coupe secondaire apparaît bien plus souvent dans le 1er hémistiche (...) Pour ce qui est de la syllabe après laquelle la coupe en question peut avoir lieu, celle-ci n’est pas fixe”

A secondary caesura leads to a threefold division into IUs or a so-called tricolon (Mackridge 1990b: 208) or τριμερὴ φόρμουλα (Nakas 2008: 139f.). I will give some examples from my corpus which might contain this pattern. Note that many involve repetition (and also note the commas of the editors):

(55) Πολλοὶ ἔπεσαν, (#) πολλοὶ ἔδωκαν, # πολλοὶ ἐξεψυχῆσαν (BT 5359)  
“Many fell, many waged [war], many died”

(56) πολλὰ εἶπαν, (#) πολλὰ ἐσύντυχαν, # πολλὰ διαλογίζονται (BT 5505)  
“they said a lot, they spoke a lot, they conversed a lot”

(57) ὅλος τρυφή, (#) ὅλος χαρά, # ὅλος ἀγαθοσύνη. (BT 2195)  
“wholly delightful, wholly cheerful, wholly friendly”

(58) μὴ ξενωθῆς, (#) μὴ χωριστῆς, # μὴ πάγης ἀπ’ ἐμένα. (LR 3908)  
“do not go, do not separate, do not go away from me”

(59) μετὰ χαρᾶς, (#) μετὰ τιμῆς, # μετὰ λαμπρᾶς τῆς φήμης. (LR 3951)  
“with joy, with honour, with shining fame”

(60) τὰ κάλλη δέ, (#) τὰς χάριτας # τὰς τοῦ περιβολίου (AB 767)  
“the beauties, the graces, the things of the enclosed garden”

(61) Λέγε μοι, (#) λέγε τὴν βουλήν, # λέγε τὸ θέλημά σου. (LR 2090)  
“Tell me, tell the advice, tell your will”

The (few) verses with IU-interrupting vocatives are also tentative candidates:<sup>25</sup>

(62) Λέγε με, ξένε, (#) λέγε με, # λέγε, διὰ τὴν ψυχὴν σου. (LR 3283; cf. LR 3245)  
“Tell me, stranger, tell me, tell, through your soul”

(63) Ἄφες με, μήτηρ, (#) ἄφες με, # τρῶσιν ἐγὼ οὐδὲν ἔχω (AB 1293)  
“Leave me, mother, leave me, I do not have a wound”

(64) δέξου με, Φράγκε, (#) δέξου με, # ἔρχομαι πρὸς ἐσένα. (AB 1584)  
“Receive me, Frank, receive me, I come towards you”

(65) Μνήσκου, καρδιά μου, (#) μνήσκου με # καὶ μὴ μὲ ἐλησμονήσης (AB 1713)  
“Remember, my heart, remember me, and do not forget me”

(66) Ἦκουσες, φίλε, (#) ἤκουσες # παράξενην βισκίνα (LR 2298)  
“You heard, friend, you heard, of the wonderful pool”

Promisingly, this threefold pattern would constitute a parallel with the modern folk songs composed in the πολιτικὸς στίχος:

“In only one form of oral narrative poetry that I am familiar with has the BT [= Butz Triad] extended more generally. In Greek folk-poetry (...) even before the generalisation of rhyme, BTs were already frequent” (Morgan 1983: 54)

The Jeffreys too have been struck by the similarities between the patterns, including the threefold one, of the πολιτικὸς στίχος of the modern folk songs and the πολιτικὸς στίχος of Manganeios, a LMG poet:

“Some striking but isolated examples of similar patterns may be found in many longer vernacular Greek poems of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but it is hard to demonstrate that similar matrices are in play at the level of composition. (...) In studying Manganeios’ phrase-patterns for the introduction to the edition, we have been repeatedly struck by their similarity to those of Modern folk-song” (E. & M. Jeffreys p.c. 26/06/2011)

Horrocks (2010<sup>2</sup>: 408) distinguishes two patterns with regard to the folk songs: either two parts (8 + 7) or three parts (4 + 4 + 7). Indeed, in these songs the secondary break

---

<sup>25</sup> As just mentioned, vocatives hardly ever occur *inside* one of the two standard half-verses; cf. supra 5.1.3.5.



preferably occurs at the fourth syllable (Baud-Bovy 1936: 58), although Sifakis (1988: 165) also mentions the third syllable as a possibility.<sup>26</sup> Romaios (1963) is the authority on the field of threefolders in the folk songs: he has devoted his dissertation entitled “Ὁ νόμος τῶν τριῶν στὸ δημοτικὸ τραγούδι” to this subject.<sup>27</sup> As an example, I give a folk song verse with a triple pattern consisting of three literally repeated interrogative indicatives, in which the second boundary falls after the fourth syllable:

θέτε φαγί, (#) θέτε πιτό, # θέτε ψιλὸ τραγούδι; (Romaios 1963: 64)  
 “do you put food, do you put booze, do you set fine songs?”

Such a secondary IU boundary at the fourth syllable results in rhythmical variation and especially in a very well-balanced pattern (4 + 4 # 7): “The popular line normally falls into two balancing halves (and the first may be divided in turn)” (Horrocks 2010<sup>2</sup>: 394).<sup>28</sup> Indeed, this pattern consists of two (quasi-)equal elements of which the first is subdivided into two equal ones (Mackridge 1990b: 205).

The existence of this threefold pattern would – once again – constitute an interesting parallel with Homeric discourse (cf. supra 1.2.1.2): “The same phenomenon [= triple pattern] presents itself in the ancient Greek hexameter, in which the division of the line into equal halves was regularly avoided” (Morgan 1983: 46), for instance:

Ἀτρεΐδης τε # (φ)ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν # καὶ δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς (Il. 1.7)  
 “Atreus’ son, king of men, and brilliant Achilles”

The Homeric specialist Kirk (1985: 20) has briefly discussed the (long neglected) phenomenon of the “rising threefolder”, i.e. three cola (or IUs) of increasing length.<sup>29</sup> However, he also notes the existence of other threefold verses which are not rising ones (Kirk 1985: 21). This structural parallel between the modern folk songs and the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry (and the Homeric epics) is definitely worthy of further research, for it might perhaps provide evidence for the existence of a continuing oral tradition in Greece (cf. supra 1.1.2.4.2 & infra 6.3).

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Politis (1998: 115); M. Jeffreys (1981 & 2003).

<sup>27</sup> From page 61 on, Romaios (1963) deals with “νόμος τῶν τριῶν σε έναν μονάχα δεκαπεντασύλλαβο”.

<sup>28</sup> Even a modern poet such as the 19<sup>th</sup> c. Solomos (who is renowned for having written “the masterpiece of modern Greek poetry”, i.e. “The Free Besieged”) is keen on this pattern (Stavrou 1992: 66).

<sup>29</sup> This structure, which has received attention in rhetorical theory, is also called “tricolon crescendo” (Fraenkel 1957: 351).

## 5.2 Topic/focus pair

*“traiter de l’ordre des mots est donc, en quelque sorte,  
traiter de l’ordre des idées” (Weil 1879<sup>3</sup>: 1)*

### 5.2.1 Introduction: importance of topic/focus for Greek word order

Now that we have applied the IU, the basic unit within IS, to the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry, it is time to proceed to our second crucial concept: the topic/focus pair (cf. supra 2.4). This pair has played a crucial role in word order studies: in some languages, word order is constrained not (only) by syntactic but (primarily) by discourse-pragmatic determinants, namely by the pragmatic notions of topic and focus.<sup>30</sup> These languages are sometimes called “discourse-configurational” languages (Kiss 2001).<sup>31</sup> Greek is such a language: analyzing word order in Greek has proven to be no easy task. In contrast to English for instance, Greek exhibits a great flexibility with respect to word order:

“the existence of a wide range of very difficult to categorize word order options shows that the Greek language does not have a strict formalized sentence structure; its word order is flexible and belongs among languages whose word order is influenced only very little by syntax” (Loudová 2007: 2)

This flexibility is the logical outcome of a system of rich nominal inflection: since it is normally clear from the morphological forms which constituent is the subject of the verb and which is the object, every permutation of the order S(ubject), V(erb) and O(bject) is found.

However, this does not mean that Greek word order is free<sup>32</sup>: rather, a good deal of constituent-order variation is pragmatically conditioned. More concretely: the order of constituents is largely determined by the fact whether the information which one wants to convey is either *topical* or *focal*. Since Greek remains a highly inflected language in all its stages, we can expect the topic/focus pair to play a crucial role throughout its whole

---

<sup>30</sup> In this section (5.2), the notion of topic will consistently be used in its strict linguistic sense (as a so-called *sentence topic*), i.e. as opposed to focus; cf. supra 2.4.2.

<sup>31</sup> Devine & Stephens (2000) refer to Ancient Greek even as a “non-configurational” language, but their treatment reflects the importance of pragmatic factors.

<sup>32</sup> Think, for instance, of the fairly fixed position of the Wackernagel particles in Ancient Greek or of the verbal unit in Standard Modern Greek, cf. supra 4.2.2.

history. However, while Ancient Greek (5.2.1.1) and the modern standard language (5.2.1.2) are both very well investigated in this respect, there are disappointingly few studies on the importance of the topic/focus pair to describe word order in LMG (5.2.1.3).

### 5.2.1.1 Ancient Greek

As for Ancient Greek word order, our understanding of its complexities has increased significantly in the last fifteen years: a pragmatic approach now underlies many recent studies. As a consequence, there is nowadays agreement that Ancient Greek word order is to a large extent pragmatically determined. The study of Ancient Greek word order has made such significant progress thanks to the two seminal studies by H. Dik (1995) and Matic (2003), which I will briefly outline below. Especially the topic/focus pair has proven to be useful for a description of Ancient Greek word order.<sup>33</sup>

In her doctoral dissertation “Word Order in Ancient Greek”, H. Dik (1995) builds on the theoretical model offered by her (unrelated) namesake Simon Dik, the founding father of Functional Grammar, and thus adopts a functional perspective. Based on Herodotos and tragic dialogue, two corpora which are close to the spoken language, H. Dik has discovered that the typical Ancient Greek clause<sup>34</sup> consists of two pragmatically “marked” preverbal slots, followed by the predicate position and the pragmatically “unmarked” postverbal positions.<sup>35</sup> Schematically, this gives the following sequence:

topic – focus – verb – pragmatically unmarked (H. Dik 1995: 12)

Note that this scheme mixes up pragmatic notions (topic/focus) with word classes (verb): a verb too can be topicalised or focalised.

In his extensive article “Topic, focus, and Discourse Structure. Ancient Greek Word Order”, Matic (2003) challenges H. Dik’s assumption that Ancient Greek word order is “merely” determined by a simple topic/focus dichotomy, because his investigation of Xenophon’s *Anabasis* showed that only 49% of the sentences follow the above pattern. According to Matic (2003: 573), matters are more complex: he proposes a number of

---

<sup>33</sup> In a pretheoretical timeframe, Weil (1879<sup>3</sup>) has anticipated the modern notions of topic and focus by the descriptions “le point du depart” and “le but du discours” and thus seems the first scholar who has understood that word order in Ancient Greek is determined by pragmatics (cf. Celano 2013: 247).

<sup>34</sup> Note that H. Dik uses the “traditional” notion of clause; cf. supra 2.3.3.

<sup>35</sup> The placement of important information at the beginning of the utterance seems to be a cross-linguistic truth (Givón 1983: 20 & 2001: 250; Gundel 1988: 229; H. Dik 2007: 38). More concretely, there even seems to exist a widespread “topic first principle” (Lambrecht 1981: 57).

additional word order schemas. To begin with, he distinguishes between a “broad” and a “narrow” focus (cf. supra 2.4.3).<sup>36</sup> A second innovation is the distinction between a number of different topic types which are located at different positions in the clause: more precisely, he adds positions for preverbal contrastive topics and postverbal continuous topics, which eventually results in the following sequence:

contrastive-topic – continuous-topic – narrow focus – verb – continuous-topic –  
broad-focus/background

These groundbreaking studies have triggered a number of publications.<sup>37</sup> Both Lühr (2008) and Allan (2012 & 2014), for instance, add further complications by also involving complex sentences/clauses (rather than focusing solely on simple clauses, as H. Dik and Matic’ do). Lühr (2008) explores complex sentences with embedded infinitives in Thucydides’ *Historiae*, while Allan (2012) concentrates on “intertwining clauses”. Allan (2014), for instance, distinguishes no fewer than five (!) topic positions (cf. supra 2.4.3).<sup>38</sup>

### 5.2.1.2 Standard Modern Greek

With regard to Standard Modern Greek as well, there is nowadays agreement that its word order is conditioned by the topic/focus pair: “MG order is likely to be affected by pragmatic categories” (Philippaki-Warburton 1985: 115f.).<sup>39</sup> While the topic/focus pair is believed to have universal applicability (Gundel 1988), the concrete means to identify the topic and the focus, though, are language-specific (S. Dik 1997<sup>2</sup>: 309-335).<sup>40</sup> Standard Modern Greek has at its disposal a special mechanism to mark objects as topics, i.e. “clitic doubling”: “Greek uses an important device for indicating topic and focus, namely the use or non-use of weak pronouns referring to the object” (Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warburton 2004: 230).

---

<sup>36</sup> In his turn, Matic’'s thesis is contradicted by Celano (2013), who argues that Ancient Greek focus structure is dependent on prosodic structure.

<sup>37</sup> Dik’s and Matic’'s insights have also been applied to post-Classical Greek (e.g. Shing Chung Kwong 2005; Banti 2013).

<sup>38</sup> Allan (2014) disconnects topic and focus constructions: on the one hand, he posits a topic system comprising the above mentioned five topic constructions and, on the other hand, a focus system of two focus constructions.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Lascaratou (1998: 152); Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warburton (2004: 229ff.).

<sup>40</sup> A distinct intonation is one of the most commonly cited linguistic devices to distinguish topical from focal information (and vice versa) (S. Dik 1997<sup>2</sup>: 309-335). However, the presence of certain particles or DMs might in some languages also provide us with clues; cf. supra 2.5.4.

In modern linguistics, clitic doubling is defined as “the co-occurrence of a direct and/or indirect object NP [noun phrase] and a coreferential clitic pronoun attached to the verb” (Janse 2008: 165). Especially in Balkan languages, clitic doubling is a common phenomenon, as in the next example from Albanian:<sup>41</sup>

Ana e lexoi libr-in (Kallulli 2008: 230)

“Ana read the book”

Many answers have been proposed to the question when exactly this construction is used: the object should be animate/definite/familiar/specific/etc. (Guentchéva 2008: 203). However, most suggestions can be related to the current standard view: clitic doubling is a device for marking objects as *topics*. This also applies to Standard Modern Greek: clitic doubling, which is probably one of the most intensively studied issues in Standard Modern Greek linguistics, has unanimously been called a device for indicating topics (Revithiadou & Spyropoulos 2008: 44), for example:

tin ayapái ti Yarimía (Janse 2008: 167)

Topic: “He loves Yarimía”

Versus

ti Yarimía ayapái (Janse 2008: 171)

Focus: “It is Yarímia he loves”

As explained in my theoretical chapter (cf. supra 2.4.1), however, the notion of topic is often mingled with the concept of referential givenness, which results in claims that only referentially given direct objects can be doubled (Anagnostopoulou 1999: 761; Tomić 2006: 320). Standard Modern Greek, however, provides clear evidence that *topicality* is responsible for clitic doubling and that referential givenness is only an indirect – albeit natural – consequence of it. The mark of referential givenness is generally said to be definiteness (cf. Brown & Yule 1983: 169ff.; cf. supra 2.4.1). Now, both definite and indefinite direct objects can be doubled in Standard Modern Greek (Tomić 2006: 323).<sup>42</sup> This proves that it is not definiteness and thus not referential givenness that constitutes the prerequisite for licensing clitic doubling, but topicality.

---

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Kazazis & Pentheroudakis (1976: 398); Guentchéva (2008: 204); Krapova & Cinque (2008: 278).

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Philippaki-Warbuton (1985); Alexopoulou & Folli (2011).

### 5.2.1.3 Late Medieval Greek

Given the significance of the concepts of topic and focus in both Ancient Greek and Modern Greek, we might expect that in the intermediate period of LMG the topic/focus pair can also provide us with clarifying insights into word order phenomena. However, pragmatic analyses of word order in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry are non-existent. Within the scope of OCP research, though, the topic/focus pair has been touched upon (cf. supra 4.2.1.2.4). In what follows, I will delve more deeply into this research (5.2.1.3.1). I will evaluate these previous proposals (5.2.1.3.3) before introducing my own view (5.2.1.3.3).

#### 5.2.1.3.1 Disputed pragmatic principle OCPs

Remember that pragmatics has been said to play a role with regard to the OCP distribution in LMG: “the rules are primarily a matter of syntactic context and secondarily a matter of pragmatics (in this case, emphasis)” (Mackridge 1993: 326; cf. supra 4.2.1.2.4). A high degree of consensus has been reached on the former, syntactic, rule: it has been taken for granted that after (most) function words (mainly subordinators) preverbal placement of the OCP is “near-categorical” (Pappas 2004: 42). The same holds for so-called preferential words (cf. supra 4.2.1.2.4).

Conversely, other constituents (nouns, adjectives and most adverbs) that immediately precede the verb might also attract the OCPs into preverbal position, yet not as categorically as function words. Pioneer Mackridge is convinced that the decisive criterion is emphasis: after “semantically emphasised” constituents preverbal OCPs are “almost obligatory” (Mackridge 1993: 341). It is this second, pragmatic – and apparently less compulsory – principle that has caused some heated discussions among LMG OCP researchers. I will give a short overview of the different proposals after Mackridge, but first I will specify his account.

#### *Emphasis by Mackridge*

Mackridge’s (1993: 341) precise formulation of the pragmatic principle reads as follows: “The order pronoun + verb is almost obligatory when some semantically emphasised word or phrase (non-temporal adverb, object or subject or object complement) precedes the verb phrase”. It is conspicuous that the grammatical role of subject is not included

between the brackets (only subject *complement* is included).<sup>43</sup> According to Pappas (2001: 83 & 2004: 38), the reason for this exclusion lies in the (common) assumption that the canonical constituent order is SVO in LMG. Mackridge (1993: 341) indeed formulates a separate rule concerning preverbal subjects. Nonetheless, he suggests that the same principle is active here: he is certain that, when the subject receives special emphasis, the pronoun precedes the verb (Mackridge 1993: 331). In this context, we must consider Mackridge's (1993: 326) criticism of his predecessor Rollo (1989): "the greatest failing of Rollo's study is that he ignores the contribution of emphasis to the position of the clitic pronoun" (cf. Vejleskov 2005: 197).

Most scholars after Mackridge do not ignore that pragmatics must play some role: they intuitively feel that the distribution of LMG OCPs is not regulated by purely syntactic rules. However, they have not simply adopted Mackridge's view, mainly because of the vagueness of the notion of emphasis. Indeed, this very general notion may very easily lead to circular reasoning: if preverbal OCPs occur after a non-function word, this word will be assumed to carry emphasis, whereas postverbal OCPs will automatically become associated with words lacking emphasis (cf. Chila-Markopoulou 2004: 203). Therefore, several attempts have been made to embed the pragmatic principle in a more solid framework and thus to replace the notion of emphasis with a theoretically more robust concept. Most researchers appeal to the linguistically established topic/focus distinction.<sup>44</sup> More precisely, they are convinced that *focalised* constituents might attract OCPs into preverbal position, while topicalised information gives rise to postverbal OCPs. Before explaining this hypothesis, which I will fine-tune, I will outline the deviant views of Pappas (2004) and Thoma (2007).

### *Fronting by Pappas*

Pappas (2004: 11), whom we can call Mackridge's most radical opponent, also finds that Mackridge's concept of emphasis is highly problematic:

---

<sup>43</sup> *Temporal* adverbs are also excluded, because Mackridge (1993: 340) observes more variation between preverbal and postverbal OCPs after them, and thus claims that here the position of the OCP is "relatively free". A distinction between genuine temporal adverbs (with conceptual meaning) and adverbs used as DMs (with procedural meaning) might be clarifying; cf. *infra* 5.3.2.1.

<sup>44</sup> Van der Merwe (1989) argues to replace the vague notion of emphasis by "focus" in linguistic treatises in general.

“he does not go into detail about the nature of emphasis or the mechanism of ‘attraction’. Given the weight that both of these terms are given in the exposition it is unfortunate that they are not explained more fully”

Pappas (2004: 44) minimises the impact of pragmatics. His most extreme point of view reads as follows: “neither emphasis on a preverbal element (e.g. object, subject, etc.), nor the topic-focus distinction have any affect on the position of weak object pronouns” (Pappas 2004: 72).<sup>45</sup> Of course, Pappas cannot deny that preverbal constituents other than function words very often occur with preverbal OCPs, yet he sees no statistic correlation between preverbal *focalised* constituents and preverbal OCPs (cf. Thoma 2007: 142). As a consequence, Pappas (2004: 42; cf. also 90) simply concludes that the preverbal, so-called fronted, position of these non-function words is a sufficient criterion to attract OCPs into preverbal position: “when the verb is preceded by a fronted constituent, there is a strong but not categorical tendency for the pronoun to appear preverbally”. Among this class of preverbal constituents, Pappas (2004: 158) includes objects, prepositional phrases and non-temporal adverbs. Subjects are excluded, as well as temporal adverbs, because after these elements, the position of the OCP varies “freely” between preverbal and postverbal position (Pappas 2004: 90; cf. Mackridge 1993). In sum, Pappas’ view can be called purely syntactic: only the position of the constituent in relation to the verb and its grammatical role matter.

#### *Discontinuity by Thoma*

Thoma (2007: 147), whose corpus consists of prose texts from the 16<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> centuries (rather than of LMG πολιτικός στίχος poems), agrees with Pappas to a certain extent: “the placement of the clitic pronoun depends on the position of the fronted element and not on its being focalised”. On the contrary, Thoma claims that most preverbal OCPs appear after constituents that are *not* focalised (Thoma 2007: 154).

Yet unlike Pappas, Thoma looks for an explanation *why* these constituents stand in preverbal position. Unsurprisingly, she finds the answer in pragmatics, more specifically in Givón’s (1979) framework of referential cohesion in narrative discourse. Thoma (2007: 155) finds a one-to-one relationship between syntax, i.e. the preverbal position of subjects, objects and adverbs, and pragmatics, i.e. their pragmatic function as “discontinuity markers”:

---

<sup>45</sup> Elsewhere, however, Pappas (2004: 59) seems more moderate: “nevertheless, this distinction between a focus and a topic reading could prove useful when examining preverbal objects”; cf. *infra* 5.2.3.



“narrative discourse is about ‘referents’ (...) Referential cohesion tracks these referents and brings them back into the foreground when needed after having been relayed to a backgrounded position for a while or when the mention of other referents interferes and makes their mental retrieval difficult. The junctures in discourse where referents are brought back into the foreground are marked by long fronted discontinuity elements”

In Thoma’s view, the preverbal position of the OCPs then intensifies the effect of a discontinuity or break in the discourse, as the OCP demarcates the preverbal constituent from the verb and places it apart “giving it more emphasis” (Thoma 2007: 155). In other words, the preverbal constituents occurring with preverbal OCPs are “emphasised chunks of information” (Thoma 2007: 159). Eventually, we are thus again left with the vague notion of emphasis...

### *Focus*

Several researchers have questioned Mackridge’s initial assumption that SVO is the canonical constituent order of LMG (cf. Chila-Markopoulou 2004: 203).<sup>46</sup> Consequently, they do not believe that the preverbal position of a constituent exercising the function of object (OVS) *automatically* points to emphasis. Rather than attempting to establish a traditional constituent order, these OCP researchers are convinced that word order in LMG, as in all stages of the Greek language, is to a large extent pragmatically determined. Adherents of this view do not claim a one-to-one relationship between position and pragmatic function (like Thoma) but believe that the constituent before the verb can be both topic or focus – or simply pragmatically unmarked: “the fronting of the object in a pro-drop (or ‘null-subject’) language such as Greek is not necessarily associated with focus” (Chila-Markopoulou 2004: 203; cf. Horrocks 2010: 279f.).

Horrocks (2010<sup>2</sup>) was one of the first to suggest a correlation between preverbal focalised constituents and preverbal OCPs in LMG. In his monograph on the history of the Greek language, Horrocks (2010<sup>2</sup>: 109; cf. also 173 & 280) opposes the sequence “preverbal focal phrase + OCP + verb” to “preverbal topic + verb + OCP”. Condoravdi & Kiparsky (2004: 165) also endorse the view the topic/focus distinction is crucial in determining the precise position of the OCP: if a preverbal subject, object or adverb is the topic, it occurs with postverbal OCPs; if it is the focus, it occurs with preverbal OCPs.

---

<sup>46</sup> Horrocks (2010<sup>2</sup>: 108f. & 279), for instance, observes that in the period under investigation a change in the dominant constituent order is taking place: VSO is becoming the standard word order.

Revithiadou & Spyropoulos (2006: 29) share the same opinion: “we concur with Condoravdi & Kiparsky (2004) that the variation in clitic placement (preverbal-postverbal) with respect to subjects and temporal expressions in Medieval Byzantine (...) is associated with the focus vs. topic reading of these elements and is therefore systematic”.<sup>47</sup> Furthermore, Revithiadou & Spyropoulos (2006: 32) conclude their paper by suggesting that future research should “explore the behavior of clitics in constructions that usually have dramatic effects on the prosodic organization of a clause, such as focus and topicalization”. I have gladly undertaken this task, but before executing it, I will point out a problematic aspect of the above approaches.

### 5.2.1.3.2 Evaluation of the previous proposals

One has probably noticed that the above LMG OCP researchers do not treat the group of preverbal constituents as a whole, but divide them into subcategories. I repeat that Mackridge (1993: 341) had distinguished preverbal subjects and temporal adverbs from other preverbal constituents (non-temporal adverbs, objects, subject complements, object complements). In a later article, Mackridge himself replaces his former notion of emphasis by the concept of focus: OCPs can be attracted into preverbal position by “some semantically and syntactically focalised word or phrase (non-temporal adverb; noun or adjective in an object noun phrase; or subject or object complement)” (Mackridge 2000: 134). However, he still considers preverbal subjects a problematic, separate category:

“if the rules regarding topicalised and focalised elements before the verb-pronoun complex in Medieval Greek applied to subjects too, then the order should be S + V + P when S is topic/S + P + V when S is focus. (...) Nevertheless, it is not always possible to see this pattern being observed with subjects in practice” (Mackridge 2000: 136)

The same holds for Pappas’ analysis (2004: 90). He also considers preverbal subjects and temporal expressions as a separate category presenting more variation – “free variation” according to him – between preverbal and postverbal OCPs than preverbal objects, prepositional phrases and non-temporal adverbs. Thoma (2007: 143-156), on the other hand, claims that her discontinuity hypothesis applies to preverbal objects,

---

<sup>47</sup> In their schematic overview, however, Revithiadou & Spyropoulos (2006: 29) again use the notion of emphasis to designate preverbal constituents attracting OCPs into preverbal position: “clitics are preverbal with function words and fronted emphatic elements and postverbal otherwise”.

subjects and adverbs. Condoravdi & Kiparsky (2004: 165) take the same elements into account, while Revithiadou & Spyropoulos (2006: 29) only seem to include preverbal subjects and temporal expressions.

It is clear that these subcategories are characterised by a high amount of confusion: grammatical roles (e.g. subject) are mingled up with word classes (e.g. adverbs), semantic notions (e.g. temporal expressions) and phrasal categories (e.g. prepositional phrases). This inconsistency may well present one of the main reasons for the disagreement concerning the pragmatic principle, as Chila-Markopoulou (2004: 202) has already observed: “even though it is never mentioned, this could well be one of the factors that prevent the formulation of generalizations”. Indeed, it would be a huge step forward if we could formulate one general principle, namely if we could demonstrate that the OCP distribution after *all* preverbal constituents is regulated by the *same* – pragmatic – principle, which results in the attraction of OCPs into preverbal position. This formulation would make the question to which word class the preverbal constituent (noun, adjective, adverb) belongs or the question which grammatical role (subject, object, subject/object complement, modifier) it exercises irrelevant. We can call this view the “focus hypothesis” and it is this hypothesis which I will defend in the remainder of section 5.2.

#### 5.2.1.3.3 My own view: the focus hypothesis

I will begin by giving some general arguments in favour of the focus hypothesis: these will be of a diachronic, a dialectal and a cross-linguistic nature. Afterwards, I will explain why the focus hypothesis still risks being called subjective. However, I will propose my solution to overcome this charge.

##### *Diachronic continuity*

A first reason why the focus hypothesis is very plausible, is that it does not appear from nowhere: the validity of the pragmatic principle – and more precisely of the topic/focus pair – for the distribution of OCPs has been demonstrated for previous stages of the Greek language (cf. supra 4.2.1.2).<sup>48</sup> Janse, for instance, has observed that in post-Classical Greek, OCPs are optionally triggered by the presence, in preverbal position, of

---

<sup>48</sup> For a detailed discussion of the continuity of the Greek OCP distributional system, see Soltic (2012: 180-184), in which I show that the LMG rules clearly constitute a gradual continuation of older – post-classical – tendencies.

“a focused word or constituent” (Janse 2008: 178; cf. supra 4.2.1.2.3).<sup>49</sup> With regard to the period which immediately precedes LMG, the topic/focus distinction has also been accorded merit: “in EMed.Gk. [Early Medieval Greek, 5<sup>th</sup>-10<sup>th</sup> c.], most clitic pronouns are immediately postverbal (...), although the preverbal position adjacent to a focused element is possible” (Holton & Manolessou 2010: 557; cf. Kisilier 2003).

### *Dialectal support*

The usefulness of the topic/focus pair has even been reported when describing the OCP system in *contemporary* Greek, that is to say: in certain modern dialects. As mentioned, some modern dialects show a different OCP pattern than the standard language (cf. supra 4.2.1.2.5). Janse (1998b & 2006) has not only discovered native speakers of the Cappadocian dialect, which was long believed to have died out, but has also exposed the subtleties of this dialect’s OCP distributional system. In Cappadocian Greek, which also shows variation between preverbal and postverbal OCPs, the OCPs stands in preverbal position when the subjects “constitute the information focus of the respective utterances, since they carry new information” (Janse 1998b: 262).<sup>50</sup> This observation is extremely relevant for LMG, since it has been established that the Cappadocian dialect has preserved many linguistic features from the period under investigation, including the OCP distribution. The same holds for the modern dialect of Cypriot: Chatzikyriakidis (2010: 359) compares its OCP distributional system to that of LMG.<sup>51</sup> Accordingly, preverbal OCPs can be found after “focused deictic objects, non-coreferential with the clitic” as well as after “focused subjects and adverbs” (Chatzikyriakidis 2010: 166f.).

### *Cross-linguistic parallels*

A final – very general – argument in favour of the focus hypothesis is that the attractive power of preverbal focalised information towards OCPs has been noted in several languages in the world. Cysouw (2003: 2), a famous clitic typologist, acknowledges the importance of informational status with regard to the OCP distribution in certain

---

<sup>49</sup> Chatzikyriakidis (2010: 338) presumably shares the same view, but does not utter the term “focus”: “it can be argued that the clitic positioning system of KG [Koine Greek] is not governed by syntactic constraints but rather by underlying pragmatic preferences”.

<sup>50</sup> Note that Janse commits the often-made mistake of confusing the notion of focus with that of “referential newness”; cf. supra 2.4.1.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Terzi (1999); Ralli (2006).

languages: “If there is some flexibility for the placement of pronominal clitics, they will be attached to the most focal element in the clause” (Cysouw 2003: 14).

Let me exemplify this common cross-linguistic pattern by drawing in some Romance languages.<sup>52</sup> Latin has undergone a similar development of the OCP system as Greek (Adams 1994; Janse 1994a & 2000). As a consequence, the OCP distribution in Medieval Spanish and Portuguese can to a certain extent be compared to the LMG situation. Martins (2003: 208) associates preverbal focalised constituents with preverbal OCPs in Medieval Spanish and Portuguese. This is confirmed by Granberg (1999: 101) with respect to (preverbal subjects in) 13<sup>th</sup> c. Spanish: “clitics follow the verb unless a preceding subject can be interpreted as an important focus of information” (cf. Janse 1994a: 137). Elsewhere, though, Granberg (1999: 90 & 108) is less concrete and uses the notion of emphasis. Bouzouita’s (2008: 64) description is also rather vague:

“it is not the lexical entry of the subject itself which determines which clitic position will be used, but rather the discourse-pragmatic conditions under which these subjects are uttered which influence the placement of the subsequent clitic”

Furthermore, the pragmatic notion of focus continues to play a role in the OCP system of some *contemporary* Romance dialects. In modern Galician in particular, the topic/focus pair seems to have preserved its relevance: preverbal focalised items might trigger OCPs into preverbal position, as opposed to topicalised elements (Gupton 2012: 278; Granberg 1999: 93). In the same way as I have just done for Greek, Bouzouita (2008: 88ff.) relates the contemporary dialectal situation to the medieval OCP distribution:

“These Western Iberian languages [Asturian and Galician] display at present very similar clitic distributions, the underlying principles of which seem to be identical to those in 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> MedSp [Medieval Spanish]. The same seems also true for Medieval Portuguese” (Bouzouita 2008: 95)

### *Subjectivity*

It might have caught the eye that the OCP scholars explicitly use the term “focus” and are thus less vague where modern spoken languages are concerned than when older stages of languages are described. This should not come as a surprise, for we dispose of more means to identify topical/focal information with respect to living languages, in casu speakers who utter prosodic information and whom we can interrogate on their

---

<sup>52</sup> In Polish too, similar pragmatic mechanisms are at work: “preverbal placement of the clitic pronouns in Polish can only be properly understood in relation to focused (preverbal) constituents” (Janse & Tol 1998).

intentions (or of whom we at the very least possess tape recordings). This is important, since the concept of focus entails a subjective aspect, as it is the *speaker* who ultimately decides what s/he presents as the most important information of the utterance (cf. supra 2.4.1). The crucial role of choice on the speaker's part is stressed by H. Dik (2007: 32): "Focus function is assigned to an element expressing the information that the speaker considers the most urgent part of the message s/he wants to convey to the listener".

In the case of so-called dead languages, such as LMG, we are of course deprived of living witnesses and of prosodic information. The nature of our data is likely the reason why the focus hypothesis is still disputed in LMG, despite all diachronic, dialectal and cross-linguistic evidence in favour of it: texts alone are at our disposal... Consequently, the attribution of topic/focus risks being a very subjective endeavour (Goldstein 2008: 5). Mambrini (2013: 1), who investigates Ancient Greek, even calls it a speculative work, because it heavily relies on the different interpretations of the texts given by each reader. The seeming impossibility to verify whether a constituent is rightly assigned topic or focus status has probably tempted Vejleskov (2005: 207f.) to declare that purely syntactic OCP rules would be a theoretical desideratum for LMG:

"since the examples which have hitherto been presented of verb phrases with a pre-posed weak object pronoun following a focalized word or phrase – in demotic texts dating no later than 1500 – are so few, I believe that this aspect needs further discussion. This is the only rule which is expressed in semantic (or "pragmatic") terms, while all the other rules are expressed in syntactical terms. In the case of Apokopos, I believe that it is possible to state the rules governing the position of the weak object pronoun in syntactical terms alone. Thus, I think that from a descriptive point of view, this is to be preferred"

Condoravdi & Kiparsky (2004: 166) too are aware of the subjectivity of assigning topic/focus status in texts:

"focus structure is not automatically fixed by the textual context, or even by the extralinguistic context, because it depends on what the speaker has in mind and wants to express. A constituent may be focused if the speaker or writer thinks of it as contributing to a particularly noteworthy or surprising piece of information, or wishes to represent it as such, but in the absence of enough syntactic or intonational cues one would have to be a mind-reader to predict when that is the case"

However, in the case of *literary* texts, this quotation brings things to a head: Condoravdi & Kiparsky's statement that "one would have to be a mind-reader" is irrelevant to the study of literature, since the speakers in such texts do not actually have minds – being

no more than constructs of the author. The extralinguistic context is, as it were, “absorbed” in the textual one.<sup>53</sup> The embedding of the context in the text is indeed a great – yet often-forgotten – advantage of literature when doing pragmatically oriented research (cf. H. Dik 2007: 33).

Nonetheless, a certain degree of arbitrariness of course remains. In what follows, I will reduce the subjectivity inextricably involved in identifying the topic/focus pair by means of two complementary studies. In the first study, I will identify so-called light verbs as a fairly objective means to verify that ad hoc focalised information attracts OCPs into preverbal position (5.2.2). The second study concerns the first investigation of clitic doubling in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry, which I will show to be a device for indicating topics already in LMG (5.2.3).

## 5.2.2 Light verbs

In this section, I will concentrate on a very specific environment in which the subjectivity inextricably connected with the focus hypothesis can be strongly diminished, namely in the case of so-called light verbs (5.2.2.1). The text on which I have conducted this study is the *Chronicle of Morea*.<sup>54</sup>

### 5.2.2.1 Focalised direct objects

Verbs too can have a certain pragmatic value, although this often seems to be forgotten (e.g. H. Dik 1995; cf. supra 5.2.1.1). Consequently, it might be revealing to once examine the OCP data from the perspective of the verb. Some verbs have very little conceptual meaning of their own: their meaning is so unspecific that they need a complement in order to function effectively as a predicate (Crystal 2003: 270). Verbs with such an unspecific content have been termed “light verbs”. Jespersen (1965: 117) is generally credited with the invention of the term “light verb”, which he applied to very frequently used English constructions such as *have* a rest, a read, a cry, a think; *take* a sneak, a drive, a walk, a plunge and *give* a sigh, a shout, a shiver, a pull, a ring (Butt 2003: 1; cf. Brugman 2001: 552).

---

<sup>53</sup> Applied to Lambrecht’s different sources of referential givenness then, only “textual” (the earlier mentioning) and “inferential” accessibility (the presence of other, affinitive referents) are relevant – “situational” accessibility (the presence of a referent in the extralinguistic context) can be dismissed (cf. supra 2.4.1).

<sup>54</sup> For a slightly different version of this study, see Soltic (2013b).

As these examples show, a direct object usually functions as the necessary complement of the light verb. The possibility of replacing the light verb and its direct object by one sole verb is a cross-linguistic characteristic of light verbs, for example “she signs” instead of “she made a sign” (Crystal 2003: 270). In many cases, an alternative lexical verb with a more specific meaning is thus available or – in the words of Brugman (2001: 553) – a “monomorphemic paraphrase”. Hence, Butt (2003:1) even calls light verbs “verbal licensers for nouns”. Indeed, it is actually the direct object, typically belonging to the word class of the nouns, that specifies the verb’s exact meaning, as a light verb can be combined with a very large set of direct objects.

Applied to the topic/focus framework, we can assume that the direct objects of light verbs present the most noteworthy piece of information and thus constitute the focus, i.e. “the utterance’s most informational domain” (Guentchéva 2008: 211), since these verbs are low-content and as such almost predictable.<sup>55</sup> This has recently been suggested by Scheppers (2011: 287; my italics):

“verbs like ‘get’, ‘go’ and ‘take’ are relatively low-content as compared to typical nouns (...) Thus, the arguments of the verbs presented by the *focused* NPs [noun phrases] are more closely related to the specific points made than the verbs themselves”<sup>56</sup>

As a consequence, light verbs and their preverbal direct objects provide us with the perfect environment to verify the focus hypothesis: on the assumption that the direct objects of light verbs are focalised, we expect OCPs to occur without exception *before* the verb. By means of a study on two light verbs in the *Chronicle of Morea* (manuscript H), I will demonstrate that this approach is highly promising, as it confirms the accuracy of the focus hypothesis in a fairly objective way.

#### 5.2.2.2 Πιω and δίδω in the *Chronicle of Morea*

Applied to LMG, several verbs seem qualified to operate as light verbs. Indeed, light verbs are not confined to English but are very common cross-linguistically and are “often translation equivalents or cognates” (Brugman 2001: 554). I have selected two of

---

<sup>55</sup> There is of course always the possibility that another additional constituent like a spatial expression constitutes the focus (cf. Spevak 2010: 126-131). However, in the examples in the *Chronicle of Morea*, there are no additional constituents *beyond* the verb that could be alternative candidates for the focus.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Thoma (2011: 2388): “verbs of low lexicality (...) introduce entities that carry the informational load of the clause”.



the most straightforward candidates in order to keep my analysis surveyable: ποιῶ and δίδω, respectively “to make” and “to give”, both of which are also well-known light verbs in English (Crystal 2003: 270).

As mentioned above, light verbs and their direct objects can often be replaced by one verb with a specific meaning: conceptually empty verb (e.g. to give) + conceptually full direct object (e.g. an answer) => conceptually full verb (e.g. to answer). This also applies to the combinations ποιῶ/δίδω + direct object in the *Chronicle of Morea*. In order to find such a synonymous conceptually full verb, I have appealed to the dictionary of Kriaras. In the examples below, I have provided the translation of the conceptually full verb between brackets and where possible I have added a verse in which this more specific verb is used, so as to prove the equivalent form is available to the poet. Furthermore, we will also see that ποιῶ and δίδω are often interchangeable, which also testifies to their “light” character.

I have found no fewer than 69 instances of ποιῶ (24) and δίδω (45) which are preceded by their direct object and which are combined with an OCP. As expected, these direct objects are – without any exception – associated with preverbal OCPs. I will give abundant examples of both ποιῶ (5.2.2.2.1) and δίδω (5.2.2.2.2). Afterwards, I will suggest other constructions that can be used as a test case for the focus hypothesis (5.2.2.2.3) and have a look at the parallel Parisinus manuscript, as to see whether this version shows a similar picture (5.2.2.2.4).

#### 5.2.2.2.1 Ποιῶ

υπόσχομαι (“to promise”; e.g. 477: ὑπόσχθήκεν):

- (1) ὑπόσχεσιν τοῦ ἐποιήσασιν # εἰς ὅσον καταστήσῃ (CoM H 221; cf. 3346, 5370, 8545)  
Lurier (1964: 74): “they made him a promise that whatever he might arrange”
- (2) δουλωτικὰ καὶ φρόνιμα # ὑπόσχεσες τοῦ ἐποίκεν (CoM H 2430)  
Lurier (1964: 142): “humbly and with propriety he made him promises”
- (3) cf. with δίδω: τὴν δυνάμιν τοῦ ἔδωκαν # κ’ ὑπόσχεσιν τοῦ ἐποίκαν (CoM H 317)  
Lurier (1964: 76): “they gave him their power and made him a promise”

τιμῶ (“to honour”; e.g. 3110: ἐτίμησεν):

- (4) τιμὴν μεγάλην τοῦ ἔποικεν # καὶ φιλοπροσωπίαν (CoM H 2183; cf. 6146, 6433, 7124)  
Lurier (1964: 135): “and showed him great honor and a countenance of friendship”
- (5) ἰδὲς τὸ τί ἔδιαφόρησαν # καὶ τί τιμὴν σὲ ἐποίκαν. (CoM H 5124)  
Lurier (1964: 220): “see what they won for you and what honor they did to you”

- (6) cf. with δίδω: τιμὴν μεγάλην τοῦ ἔδωκεν # κ' ἐφιλοδώρησέ τον (CoM H 2228)  
Lurier (1964: 137): “he paid him great honor and gave him gifts”

συντροφεύω (“to accompany/join with”; e.g. 5781: συντροφεμένον):

- (7) Κ' ἐκ τούτου τὸν ὠδήγεψεν # καὶ συντροφίαν τοῦ ἐποίησεν (CoM H 2432; cf. 4832)  
Lurier (1964: 142): “And after this he guided him and kept him company”

- (8) cf. with δίδω: καὶ συντροφίαν τοὺς ἔδωκεν # κ' ἐδιάβησαν ἐνταῦτα. (CoM H 5168)  
Lurier (1964: 221): “and gave them a company, and they went out thereafter”

ορκίζω (“to swear”; e.g. 2357: ὀρκίζω; cf. H 1708: ὑπωμόσατο):

- (9) μὲ συμφωνίης σὲ ἐξήβαλεν # καὶ ὄρκον τοῦ ἐποίησεν (CoM H 5540)  
Lurier (1964: 232): “with agreements he released you and you swore him an oath”

εὐεργετώ (“to do good services”; e.g. 1241: εὐεργέτησεν):

- (10) εὐεργεσίαν τοὺς ἔποικεν # ἄλογα καὶ φαρία (CoM H 2953)  
Lurier (1964: 158): “he bestowed upon them gifts of horses and chargers”

- (11) cf. with δίδω: μεγάλως τὸν ἐτίμησεν # κ' εὐεργεσίης τοῦ ἔδωκεν. (CoM H 3110)  
Lurier (1964: 164): “he honored him greatly and gave him benefactions”

#### 5.2.2.2.2 Δίδω

αποκρίνομαι (“to answer”; e.g. 7468: ἀπεκρίθηκεν):

- (12) ἀπόκρισιν τοὺς ἔδωκεν, # οὕτως τοὺς ἀποκρίθη• (CoM H 362; cf. 3402, 5677, 6359)  
Lurier (1964: 77): “he answered them”

- (13) cf. with ποιῶ: βουλὴν ἀπῆραν ἐνομοῦ # κ' ἀπόκρισιν τοῦ ἐποίησαν (CoM H 3198)  
Lurier (1964: 166): “they took counsel with one another and made him an answer”

βουλεύω (“to give counsel”; e.g. 614: ἐσυμβουλευέτησαν):

- (14) Ἀλλὰ βουλὴν τοῦ ἔδωκασιν # τὰ κάστροι νὰ γαρνίσῃ (CoM H 4608; cf. 4974, 5043, 6305, 6681)  
Lurier (1964: 206): “But he was advised to garrison the castles”

- (15) ἀπολογίαν τοῦ ἔδωκασιν, # ἐδιάβη ὁπόθεν ἦλθεν. (CoM H 3808)  
Lurier (1964: 184): “they gave him leave and he returned whence he had come”

απολογιάζω (“to dismiss”; e.g. 7109: ἀπηλόγιασαν):

- (16) ἀπηλογίαν τοῦ δίδει εὐθέως # νὰ ὑπάγῃ ὅπου θέλει.  
Lurier (1964: 221): “gives him leave to go at once wherever he will.”

Κ' ἡμεῖς, ἀφέντη, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν # ἀπολογίαν μᾶς δίδεις, (CoM H 5141-5142)  
“And to us, O lord, from this moment, you give us this leave”

ξενίζω/ξενιάζω (“to receive as a guest/donate”; e.g. 2211: ξενιασμένος):

(17) καὶ τὸν Μελικ φιλοτιμᾷ # καὶ ξένια τοῦ ἐδῶκεν. (CoM H 5716)  
Lurier (1964: 236): “and gave Melik gifts and accorded gave him hospitality”

χαρίζω (“to give as a gift”; e.g. 2876: ἐχάρισεν):

(18) χαρίσματα τοῦ ἔδωκεν, # φιλοδωρίες μεγάλες (CoM H 5731)  
Lurier (1964: 237): “he gave him presents and large gifts of friendship”

πολεμῶ (“to wage war”; e.g. 5121: πολεμήσει):

(19) καὶ ἔφτασαν κι ἄρματώθησαν, # πόλεμον τοὺς ἐδῶκαν (CoM H 1536)  
Lurier (1964: 113): “arriving there, they gave battle”

δωρίζω (“to donate”):

(20) τιμὴν μεγάλην τοῦ ἔποικεν, # δωρήματα τοῦ ἐδῶκεν. (CoM H 7124)  
Lurier (1964: 272): “did him great honor and gave him gifts”

The above example even contains a cognate object.

In parentheses, I would like to draw attention to the many verbal variants (in particular of the 3<sup>rd</sup> person) in the above verses (cf. supra 1.1.1.2.1): beside ἔποικεν & ἐποίκασιν (& ἐποιήσασιν) and ἔδωκεν & ἐδώκασιν (first half-verse/IU), we find ἐποίκεν & ἐποίκαν (& ἐποιῆσεν & ἐποιῆσαν) and ἐδῶκεν & ἐδῶκαν (second half-verse/IU). Note especially the accentual “optionality” (cf. supra 4.2.3.5).

### 5.2.2.2.3 Other constructions

This very particular construction (direct objects + light verbs) is thus a promising path for further investigations, since the attribution of focus becomes a fairly objective matter. In further research we could perhaps extend our scope.

In the first place, we could involve other preverbal constituents than the direct objects, for also constituents with another grammatical role seem able to embody the actual content of ποιῶ/δίδω. Most obviously, this is the case for object complements:<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> Two more examples are CoM H 105 and 5948.

- (21) καὶ κεφαλὴν τὸν ἔποικεν # εἰς ὅλα τὰ φουσσᾶτα (CoM H 3610)  
Lurier (1964: 178): “and he made him captain over all the armies”
- (22) γαρδενάριν ἀπέστειλε, # λεγάτον τὸν ἐποιῆσεν. (CoM H 485)  
Lurier (1964: 81f.): “he sent a cardinal, whom he made legate”
- (23) Σεβαστοκράτορα τὸν ἔποικε # ὅλης τῆς Ρωμανίας (CoM H 3107)  
Lurier (1964: 163) “He made him sevastokrator of all Romania”
- (24) τὴν ρόγαν τοὺς ἐκράτησαν, # ἐχτροὺς τοὺς τοὺς ἐποίκαν. (CoM H 5435)  
Lurier (1964: 229): “they held back their pay and made them their enemies”
- (25) καὶ σύντεκνον σὺ ἔποικεν # νὰ στερεωθῇ ἡ φιλία σας. (CoM H 5542)  
Lurier (1964: 232): “and he made you a relative by baptism that your friendship might be strengthened”
- (26) μέγαν ἀμειράλην τὸν ἔποικεν # ὅλου τοῦ τοῦ ρηγάτου. (CoM H 8500)  
Lurier (1964: 308): “he made [him] grand admiral of all his kingdom”
- However, preverbal prepositional phrases can also “say more” than the light verb itself.<sup>58</sup>
- (27) Μετὰ χαρᾶς τὰ ἐποίκασιν # κι ὅλοι τὰ ἐβουλλῶσαν. (CoM H 2427)  
Lurier (1964: 142): “Gladly they drew it up and put their seals to it”
- (28) Κι ὁ πρίγκιπας, ὡς φρόνιμος, # με προθυμίαν τὸ ἐποίκεν. (CoM H 5701)  
Lurier (1964: 236): “And the prince, as a shrewd man, did it eagerly”
- (29) διὰ συντροφίαν τὸ ἐποιήσαμεν, # τίποτε οὐδὲν τὸ φταίομεν. (CoM H 5131)  
Lurier (1964: 221): “we did it to keep you company and we were in no way at fault”
- (30) Κι ἂν με ἐρωτήσῃ ὁκάποιος, # διὰ τί τρόπον τὸ ἐποίκεν; (CoM H 6660)  
Lurier (1964: 261): “And if someone were to ask me with what purpose he acted in this way”
- (31) Ὅμως ἡμεῖς τὸ ἐξεύρομεν, # ἀπὸ πικρίας τὸ ἐποίκες (CoM H 8420)  
Lurier (1964: 306): “However, we know that you did it out of bitterness”
- (32) με συμφωνίης τὸ ἔδωκαν # κ’ ἐκεῖνοι ὡσὰν κ’ οἱ ἄλλοι. (CoM H 1714; cf. 2048)  
Lurier (1964: 119): “the defenders surrendered it on terms, as the others had done”

---

<sup>58</sup> Another example is CoM H 1894.

The following three examples remind me of the verse with the cognate object (cf. *supra* δωρήματα τοῦ ἐδῶκεν):

- (33) τὸν τόπον του τὸν ἔστρεψα, # ὡς νέο δόμα τοῦ ἐδῶκα (CoM H 5908)

Lurier (1964: 241): “I returned his land to him, giving it to him as a new grant”

- (34) εἰς νέον δόμα τοῦ [τὸν] ἔδωκεν # νὰ τὸν κρατῇ ἀπὸ τότε. (CoM H 3366)

Lurier (1964: 171): “as a new grant he gave it to him to hold from then on”

- (35) ὡς δόμα νέον τοῦ τὸ ἔδωκεν # νὰ τὸ κληρονομήσουν (CoM H 8162)

Lurier (1964: 300): “he gave it to him as a new grant which might be inherited only”

Finally, certain preverbal adverbs might also embody the verb’s actual content. Take, for instance, ἐγράφως – the conceptually full verb (εγ)γράφω (“to inscribe”) being also existent (e.g. 1843: ἔγραφεν):

- (36) ἐγράφως τὲς ἐποίκασιν # κι ὠμόσασιν εἰς αὐτεῖς. (CoM H 4335)

Lurier (1964: 198): “they [the agreements] were put in writing and sworn to”

- (37) μεθ’ ὅρκου [τους] τὸ ἐστερέωσεν, # ἐγράφως τοὺς τὸ ἐποίκεν (CoM H 2097)

Lurier (1964: 132): “he established it for them in oaths and put it in writing”

- (38) ἐγράφως τοὺς τὲς ἔποικεν # μὲ κρεμαστὲς τὲς βοῦλλες. (CoM H 3031)

Lurier (1964: 160): “put them in writing, hung with seals”

- (39) Ἐκ στόματος τοὺς τὸ εἶπασιν # κ’ ἐγράφως τοὺς τὰ ἐδῶκαν (CoM H 3403)

Lurier (1964: 172): “Orally they declared it to them and presented it to them in writing as well “

- (40) ἐποίησε τοὺς προστάγματα, # ἐγράφως τοὺς ἐδῶκεν (CoM H 8818)

Lurier (1964: 316): “he drew up orders for them and gave them in writing (his power)”

These preverbal constituents are also consistently found with preverbal OCPs and thus provide further evidence for the focus hypothesis.

We could also involve more verbs. To begin with, we could also take into account verbs of denominating such as λέγω, καλῶ and ὀνομάζω. These verbs are not “light” in the narrowest sense of the word (they can, for instance, not be replaced by one conceptually full verb), but they often take object complements (usually in the form of proper names) which definitely constitute the most important information of the utterance and thus the focus:

- (41) μισὶρ Ντζεφρὲ τὸν ἔλεγον, # τ’ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρός του (CoM H 2447)

Lurier (1964: 142): “Sir Geoffrey, as he was called, the name of his father”

(42) ὥρισε γὰρ κ' ἐχτίσαν το # καὶ Λεῦτρο τὸ ὠνομάσαν. (CoM H 3037)  
Lurier (1964: 160): “he ordered that it be built, and it was named Leftro”

Besides, δείχνω (“to show”), ἔχω (“to have”), τίθημι (“to put”), πιάνω (“to get”), κρατῶ (“to hold”) and (ε)παίρνω (“to take”), φέρω (“to carry”) seem plausible candidates. Κάνω (“to do”) is also eligible, as the following example suggests:

(43) ὅλοι ἀντρειομένα ἐβάλθησαν # καὶ συντροφίαν τοῦ κάμνουν (CoM H 4031)<sup>59</sup>  
Lurier (1964: 190): “all bravely rallied around him”

cf. with ποιῶ in manuscript P: Εἰς τοῦτο τὸν ὠδήγεψε # καὶ συντροφίαν τοῦ ἐποίκεν (CoM P 4031; cf. 4832)

#### 5.2.2.2.4 Parallel Parisinus manuscript

As the above example shows, it is sometimes instructive to look at the parallel verse in the parallel Parisinus manuscript, for instance:

(44) καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν πρίγκιπα, # τέτοιαν βουλήν τοῦ δίδει (CoM H 6305)  
Lurier (1964: 253): “and he spoke to the prince, giving him this counsel”

cf. καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν πρίγκιπα, # οὕτως τὸν συμβουλεύει (CoM P 6305)  
“and he said to the prince, he advised him as follows”

P uses the specific verb συμβουλεύει (“to advise”), whereas in H the idea of advice is expressed through the direct object βουλήν, which attracts the OCP. Note that in P too, the OCP stands before the verb. Here the preverbal trigger is the adverb οὕτως, derived from the demonstrative pronoun οὗτος, which as a preferential word has a natural predilection for preverbal OCPs (cf. supra 4.2.1.2.4). A “reverse” example, in which P contains the light verb and thus the preverbal OCP, is:

(45) ἐπρόνοιασέ τοὺς ἀλλὰ δὴ # στὰ μέρη τῶν Βατίκων (CoM H 2955)<sup>60</sup>  
Lurier (1964: 158): “he enfeoffed them, furthermore, in the district of Vatika”

cf. καὶ προνοῖες τοὺς ἔδωκε # στὸ μέρος τῶν Βατίκων (CoM P 2955)

As a matter of fact, the comparison with P is revealing in another respect as well. In P, I have found 61 examples of ποιῶ (18) or δίδω (43) which are preceded by a direct object

<sup>59</sup> As noted above, the conceptually fully verb συντροφεύω also exists.

<sup>60</sup> Note the strange position of the caesura.

and which contain an OCP. As expected, the direct objects are again associated with preverbal OCPs, although one postverbal OCP appears. Nonetheless, rather than being an exception, this postverbal example actually further confirms the focus hypothesis! The sole postverbal exception is found after a form of the verb ποιῶ:

- (46) τὲς συμφωνίες ἐποίησαν τὲς, # τὲς προῖκες καὶ τοῦ γάμου (CoM P 3123)<sup>61</sup>  
 “the deals, they did them, the dowries of the wedding”

Note that the OCP τὲς shares case, number and gender with the preverbal direct object τὲς συμφωνίες. Contrary to all the above examples, this OCP is thus coreferential with the direct object. So, what we get here is an instance of clitic doubling. As mentioned, clitic doubling is a well-known mechanism to mark an object as the topic of the utterance in Standard Modern Greek (cf. supra 5.2.1.2). Now, in our example, τὲς συμφωνίες (“the deals”) can arguably be considered the topic of the utterance. Although we have seen that referential givenness and topicality are theoretically distinct concepts (cf. supra 2.4.1), the fact that τὲς συμφωνίες can be derived from the context and thus constitutes active information makes our topic interpretation very plausible. Indeed, the noun τὴν βουλήν (“the decree”), which occurs at verse 3120, refers to more or less the same concept as τὲς συμφωνίες.

It might have become clear that this apparent exception actually confirms the focus hypothesis, for it cannot be coincidental that it is precisely the postverbal exception that shows a case of clitic doubling and thus indubitably involves a preverbal topicalised direct object. As such, what we have here is a case of perfect complementary distribution: preverbal OCPs after focalised information versus postverbal OCPs after topicalised information. Moreover, the fact that *only one* topicalised direct object occurs in my corpus also validates the initial assumption that the direct objects of light verbs are naturally focalised, as the exact meaning of these verbs is actually determined by their direct objects.<sup>62</sup> The above example constitutes the perfect transition to the next section, in which I will discuss in detail the phenomenon of clitic doubling in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry.

<sup>61</sup> The equivalent verse in H contains no OCP (yet uses the longer verbal ending on -σιν; cf. supra 1.1.1.2.1):

(1) τὲς συμφωνίες ἐποίησιν # τῆς προίκα καὶ τοῦ γάμου (CoM H 3123)  
 Lurier (1964: 164): “they made the agreements over the dowry and the wedding”

<sup>62</sup> Perhaps, though, the light verb ποιῶ is in this case – exceptionally – focalised (is the actual *doing* and thus the accomplishment of the deals emphasised?), which would reinforce the postverbal position of the OCP.

### 5.2.3 Clitic doubling

The attentive reader might now raise the objection that the presence/absence of a coreferential OCP can simply serve as a general objective criterion to distinguish preverbal topicalised objects (coreferential OCP present) from preverbal focalised objects (coreferential OCP absent). However, in the period under study clitic doubling is still optional: topicalised objects can still occur *without* a coreferential OCP (Condoravdi & Kiparsky 2004: 167; De Boel 2008: 89). As a matter of fact, the optional character of the doubling construction is one of the few aspects which has been firmly established with regard to clitic doubling in LMG. For the rest, not much is known about the construction in LMG, since a detailed analysis has not yet been undertaken. It is my intention to change this. Based on my corpus of eight texts, I will propose a typology of the doubling constructions in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry (5.2.3.2) and discuss their function (5.2.3.3). Besides, I will point to the existence of some subtypes (5.2.3.4). However, I will first summarise what has already been discovered about clitic doubling in LMG (5.2.3.1).<sup>63</sup>

#### 5.2.3.1 Status quaestionis on LMG clitic doubling

To begin with, it has been hypothesised that modern clitic doubling has its origins in older Greek: “the genesis of clitic doubling through the history of Greek (...) is a natural evolution within the language” (De Boel 2008: 103; cf. Janse 2008). In Ancient Greek, a rather ambiguous or distant object could be clarified by means of an OCP which is coreferential with the object in question, for example:

ἐμοὶ μέν, εἰ καὶ μὴ καθ’ Ἑλλήνων χθόνα

“To me, although I was not on Greek ground”

τεθράμμεθ’, ἀλλ’ οὖν ξυνετὰ μοι δοκεῖς λέγειν (Euripides, *Phoenissae* 497f.; Janse 2008: 183)

“born and bred, you seem to me saying words full of sense”

The indirect object ἐμοί is separated from its verb δοκεῖς by a long subordinated clause; it is repeated in the form of its clitic counterpart μοι for the sake of clarity. A noun phrase functioning as (in)direct object is thus occasionally “doubled” by an OCP as a purely clarifying and mnemonic device in Ancient Greek. Later on, this construction presumably gets used in a more systematic way, so that in Standard Modern Greek clitic

---

<sup>63</sup> For a shortened version of this section on clitic doubling, see Soltic (2013c).



doubling has become an obligatory grammatical device for signalling topics (Janse 2008: 166).<sup>64</sup>

However, how the construction evolved in the intermediate period of LMG has not yet been fully investigated. In fact, the phenomenon of clitic doubling has only been touched upon by scholars interested in the OCP distributional system (cf. supra 4.2.1.2.4). The LMG OCP researchers are in particular interested in the precise position of the OCP and not in the peculiarities of the construction *an sich*. They note a very strong tendency for postverbal OCPs in case of clitic doubling: if an object which is coreferential with the OCP precedes the verb, this OCP “is obligatorily placed after the verb” (Mackridge 1993: 328).<sup>65</sup>

Pappas (2004: 32), though, finds “several exceptions” in his database. However, only Thoma (2007: 152f.) differs radically from the other scholars in her findings, for she associates clitic doubling with preverbal OCPs. One should bear in mind, however, that Thoma deals with a slightly later period (16<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> c.) than the other scholars. In Standard Modern Greek OCPs constituting the – doubled or otherwise – object of an indicative or subjunctive verb always appear before the verb, so Thoma’s corpus presumably anticipates the modern situation (cf. supra 4.2.1.2.5).

As far as I know, the study by De Boel (2008) is the only one which exclusively deals with clitic doubling in LMG. De Boel (2008) compares the frequency of clitic doubling in the two most important manuscripts of the *Digenis Akritis*. Whereas the “vulgarising” Escorial manuscript (E) abounds with instances of clitic doubling, the construction is completely absent from the “more archaising” Grottaferrata manuscript (G). Compare the following parallel pair:

- (1) τὴν ἀδελφὴν μας ἄφεις τὴν, # τὸν παῖδα σου ἀπαρνῆσου (DA E 346; De Boel 2008: 96)  
“our sister, leave her, deny your child”

τὴν ἀδελφὴν μας ἔασον, # τὸ τέκνον σου ἀρνῆσου (DA G 2.168; *ibid.*)  
“leave our sister, deny your child”

De Boel (2008) convincingly concludes that the scribe/poet of G avoids clitic doubling in his attempt to maintain strict – written – standards, because clitic doubling is felt typical of the colloquial – even vulgar – and thus spoken idiom: “The clitic doubling

---

<sup>64</sup> It should be noted, however, that in Standard Modern Greek clitic doubling only seems obligatory in the case of topicalised objects *preceding* the verb. Postverbal objects without a coreferential OCP are thus not necessarily interpreted as the focus of the utterance (Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warbuton 2004: 230).

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Rollo (1989: 138); Condoravdi & Kiparsky (2004: 160).

construction is characteristic of popular Greek” (Horrocks 2010<sup>2</sup>: 365). Interestingly, the same observation has been made with regard to some modern languages in which clitic doubling has not yet been fully grammaticalised but is still optional, for instance Bulgarian: “C[litic] D[oubling] constructions in formal and written Bulgarian are very rare, whereas they are very common in spoken and informal Bulgarian” (Guentchéva 2008: 216). This popular character is presumably due to the seemingly superfluous nature of clitic doubling: as far as their syntactic function is concerned, coreferential OCPs are redundant, since this syntactic function is also marked in the noun phrase (Haberland & Van der Auwera 1987: 330). In LMG, the construction is thus still optional: although a tendency towards grammaticalisation is detected, a coreferential OCP is *not automatically* present in case of a topicalised object until ca. 1600 (De Boel 2008: 89ff.).

The optional character constitutes the major difference from the contemporary language. Apart from that, though, the doubling construction in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry is in many aspects similar to the modern one. More precisely, we will see that the typology which has recently been developed by Janse (2008) on the basis of Standard Modern Greek is also applicable to the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry (5.2.3.2) and that the doubling construction serves the same pragmatic function as in Standard Modern Greek, namely marking objects as topics (5.2.3.3).

### 5.2.3.2 Four-part typology

Recently, Janse (2008: 167f.) has developed a typology of clitic doubling on the basis of Standard Modern Greek. He distinguishes two criteria: presence or absence of a breathing pause (#), and word order, more precisely: the position of the object (O) vis-à-vis the verb (V). This results in four different types of clitic doubling:

1. topicalisation (OV; – breathing pause)

ti Yarimía tin ayapái = O OCP V

2. topic left-dislocation (OV; + breathing pause)

ti Yarimía # tin ayapái = O OCP V

3. backgrounding (VO; – breathing pause)

tin ayapái ti Yarimía = OCP V O

4. topic right-dislocation (VO; + breathing pause)

tin ayapái # ti Yarimía = OCP V O

A few remarks on this typology are in order. First, it should be noted that these terms are not the standard ones in modern linguistics, especially not in the transformational-

generativist tradition. To begin with, “clitic doubling” is usually not understood in this general sense, but commonly refers to what Janse calls “backgrounding”. Moreover, Janse’s “clitic left-dislocation” and “clitic right-dislocation” are often called “hanging topic left-dislocation” and “clitic right-dislocation” respectively, whereas Janse’s “topicalisation” is known as “clitic left-dislocation” (Krapova & Cinque 2008).<sup>66</sup> To further complicate the matter: the term “topicalisation” is reserved for dislocated phrases that are topics, but linked to a gap rather than a pronoun (Dimitriadis 1994; Alexopoulou & Kolliakou 2002). In my view, though, the terms used by Janse are much more transparent. Nonetheless, as for the term “dislocation” in specific, I do not think that it is a very suitable to describe a flexible word order language such as Greek, because it implies a fixed word order (cf. *supra* 5.2.1). However, it has become the standard term (Altmann 1981: 17).

Furthermore, I am aware of the fact that the four categories present more subtle differences than is suggested here and that there are other more fine-grained morphosyntactic criteria one may use in order to differentiate between them. It has been pointed out, for instance, that a lack of agreement between the object and the OCP is normally not allowed in backgrounding constructions, whereas it is possible in topic right-dislocations (cf. *infra* 5.2.3.4.1). Something similar seems to hold for the doubling of objects which lack an article: doubled article-less objects seem ungrammatical with backgrounding (cf. *infra* 5.2.3.3.1.2). Thus, the four structures show in depth more dissimilarities than those acknowledged by Janse. Moreover, we should perhaps also recognise distinct properties according to the grammatical role of the doubled noun phrase: direct objects and indirect objects seem to behave in a distinct way in the four constructions (cf. Cinque 1990; Krapova & Cinque 2008).

In sum, I realise that the picture is much more complicated than presented here. Nevertheless, with regard to my aim, providing a first description and initial categorisation of the phenomenon in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry without becoming too theoretical, I consider the two (surface) criteria proposed by Janse (2008) sufficient. Furthermore, as I am dealing with a so-called dead language, it would make no sense to lay down criteria which cannot be tested in my corpus. For instance, the employment of a criterion such as presence/absence of pitch accent would be highly irrelevant (cf. *supra* 2.2.2). Thus, although I admit that Janse’s typology may be too simplified for a categorisation of clitic doubling in spoken living languages, I consider it ideal with regard to my corpus.

---

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Cinque (1990); Anagnostopoulou (1994 & 1999).

In what follows, I will show that this typology is perfectly applicable to the LMG πολιτικός στίχος by giving various examples which all fit into one of the four categories. Contrary to what one might think at first sight, the criterion of the presence/absence of a breathing pause is not at all inapplicable, since we have seen that both verse-end and the fixed caesura of the πολιτικός στίχος can be considered IU boundaries which imply a breathing pause (cf. supra 5.1).

Of course, the precise position of the OCPs in my corpus differs from that in the modern standard language, since the OCP distribution is regulated by other mechanisms (cf. supra 4.2.1.2). Whereas in Janse's clitic doubling typology of Standard Modern Greek only one possible position for the pronoun is given (preverbal OCPs because indicative/subjunctive verbs follow), in LMG more variation is found (preverbal and postverbal OCPs). This difference, however, is of course merely superficial.

As a matter of fact, my corpus contains exactly the same four structures of clitic doubling which have been identified for Standard Modern Greek:

Table 4 Types of clitic doubling

Total of doubled objects	887
Topicalisation	210 (23.7%)
Topic left-dislocation	391 (44.1%)
Backgrounding	78 (8.8%)
Topic right-dislocation	208 (23.4%)

The table reveals that the dislocation type is more frequent than the structure without a breathing pause (67.5% = 44.1% + 23.4%). Moreover, the doubled objects occurring at the left side of the verb (OV) prevail over those found at the right side (67.9% = 44.1% + 8.8%). Below I give abundant examples of each of the four types.

#### 5.2.3.2.1 Topicalisation

- (1) Ἴδού, τὸ κάστρον ηῦρες το, # τί ἀκαρτερεῖς, εἰπέ μας (LR 762)  
“Look, the castle, you found it, what are you waiting for, tell us”
- (2) καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἀρπάζουν την, # καὶ τὴν ζωὴν ἀφήνουν. (IB 519)  
“and her soul, they stole it, and they took her life”
- (3) τοὺς Τρῶας ἐτροπεῦσαν τους, # ἐδιώξαν τους, ὑπάγουν (BT 3912)  
“the Trojans, they conquered them, they pursued them, they pressed”

(4) ἀπάνω γὰρ εἰς τοὺς Ῥωμαίους # τὸ νῖκος νὰ τὸ ἐπάρῃ. (CoM H 6610)  
Lurier (1964: 260): “that he would be victorious over the Romans”  
=> “over the Romans, the victory, he would gain it”<sup>67</sup>

(5) τὴν Τροίαν νὰ τὴν πιάσωσι, # τὰ πάντα νὰ κερδίσουν (BT 2355)  
“Troy, they will take it, they will rob everything”

Note that the following examples contain a strong personal pronoun or a demonstrative one (cf. infra 5.2.3.3.2):

(6) Ἐμὲν ἀρέσει μὲ καλὰ # καὶ συμβουλεύω σέ το (CoM H 281)  
Lurier (1964: 75): “As for me, it pleases me well”

(7) τὴν βασιλείαν σου ἀχάνεις τὴν # κ’ ἐμᾶς ἀκλήρησές μας. (CoM H 3574)  
Lurier (1964: 177): “you lose your empire and you inherit us”  
=> “your empire, you lose it and us, you inherit us”

(8) Τοῦτο πληροφορέσου το # καὶ κράτει το ’ς ἀλήθειαν (CoM H 8939)  
Lurier (1964: 318): “Be informed of this and hold it as truth”  
=> “As for this, be informed of it and hold it as truth”

(9) Τὰ ἀλλάγια ταῦτα ποῖσε τα, # ἐδὰ ἄς καβαλλικεύσουν (BT 6906)  
“Those military units, prepare them, let them ride over here”

(10) καὶ ἐσὲν οὐδὲν σὲ ἐντρέπεται # χωρὶς τῆς βασιλείας (AB 60)  
“and you, nothing suits you without the queen”

### 5.2.3.2.2 Topic left-dislocation

(11) ἐκείνη δὲ τὸν Βέλθανδρον # ἐκατεσκόπησέν τον (VC 818)  
“and Velthandros, she saw him”

(12) τοὺς κόντους καὶ καβαλλαρίους # ἀπεχαιρέτησέν τους (CoM H 8610)  
Lurier (1964: 311): “[he] said goodbye to the counts and knights”  
=> “the counts and knights, he said goodbye to them”

---

<sup>67</sup> With regard to the *Chronicle of Morea*, I first copy Lurier’s translation and then give my own, in which the Greek word order (OCP + O or O + OCP) is more faithfully maintained (although this might sometimes result in peculiar English).

- (13) Τὴν τένταν τοῦ Δεμέστικου # θεωρῶ τὴν ἀπ’ ἐδῶθεν (CoM H 4753)  
Lurier (1964: 210): “I can see the tent of the domestikos from here”  
=> “The tent of the domestikos, I can see it from here”
- (14) Ὑστερον ἐκατήντησεν # εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν χώραν  
“Later he reached his own region”  
καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς τὴν αὐθεντιάν # ἐκληρονόμησέν τὴν. (IM 13-14)  
“and his father’s dominion, he inherited it”
- (15) καὶ τοὺς καλοὺς καβαλλαρίους # ἀγάπα τοὺς καὶ ἐτίμα (BT 2176)  
“and the great horsemen, he loved them and expressed praise”
- (16) τὸν Βέλθανδρόν μου τὸν ὠραῖον # να μὴ τὸν εὐλογήσῃ (VC 983)  
“my beautiful Velthandros, he may not join him in matrimony”
- (17) cf. τὴν σὴν πικρὰν ὑστέρησιν # πῶς νὰ τὴν ὑπομένω; (IM 142; cf. IM 201)  
“your bitter loss, how would I bear it?”
- (18) καὶ τὴν βουλὴν μου σήμερον # ἐσὲν τὴν παραδίδω (PP 348)  
“and my advice today, I give it to you”
- (19) τὰ κάλλη τοῦ προσώπου της # τίς νὰ τὰ ἱστορήσῃ; (BT 2065)  
“the beauties of her face, who could describe them?”
- (20) καὶ τὸν λαὸν τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως # ὅλοι τὸν πολεμοῦσιν (BT 9456)  
“and the people of Achilles, they all wage war against it”

The following example contains a demonstrative pronoun (cf. *infra* 5.2.3.3.2):

- (21) ἐκεῖνο τὸ ἐγκόλπιον # στὸ στήθος της τὸ θέτει. (IM 539)  
“that amulet, she places it on her chest”

### 5.2.3.2.3 Backgrounding

- (22) ἐδέεποζέξ το τὸ βεργὶν # καὶ μόνη σου να τὸ ᾄχῃς (VC 585)  
“you owned it, the stick, and you alone have it”
- (23) τόσα βιαστῆτε, ὡς φρόνιμοι, # κ’ εἰπέτε τον τὸν ρῆγαν (CoM H 8537)  
Lurier (1964: 309): “So urge, as prudent men, and speak of this to the king”  
=> “So urge, as prudent men, and speak to him, to the king”
- (24) ἐπῆραν καταπάνω τους, # τροπεύουν τοὺς τοὺς Τρῶας (BT 3723)  
“they went against them, they conquered them, the Trojans”

(25) ἐμπάσαν τους τοὺς Ἕλληνας # ἀπέσω εἰς τὰς τέντας. (BT 8274)

“they pushed them, the Greeks, inside their tents”

(26) χωρὶς βουλῆς, ἐρώτησης, # εἶχε τὴν τὴν Πελλάδα (BT 12518)

“without advice, question, he [the dead Achilles] would have had it, the Palladion”

(27) ἔκχεε το, τὸ αἶμα τους, # στὸν ἐδικόν μου τάφο (IB 1123)

“pour it out, their blood, on my own grave”

(28) ὅταν τὸ ἡῦρα τὸ παιδί # εἰς τὸν γιαλόν, στὸν ἄμμον (IB 266)

“when I found it, the child, on the coast, in the sand”

The following examples again contain a strong personal or demonstrative pronoun (cf. infra 5.2.3.3.2):

(29) κι οὐδὲν μᾶς ἄφηκες ἐμᾶς # νὰ ἔχωμεν πολεμήσει (CoM H 5121)

Lurier (1964: 220): “and you did not let us fight”

=> “and us, you did not let us fight”

(30) Καὶ ἄν μὲ πιστεύετε ἐμὲν, # ὅς ἔνι Ἀγαμέμνων (BT 8469)

“And I me, if you thrust me, let it be Agamemnon”

(31) τὸ ποῦ ἔδωκε, τί ἐγίνετον, # τίς νὰ τὴν ἔχη ἐκείνην (BT 12376)

“(he took courage to invest) where she was, what happened, who had her, that girl [Poluxene]”

#### 5.2.3.2.4 Topic right-dislocation

(32) Ἀφήνω, παρατρέχω τα # τὰ τότε λαληθέντα (LR 3564)

“I pass on, I leave them, the things said at that moment”

(33) Καὶ ὁ Ἀχιλλεὺς τὴν ἔλεγεν # τὴν ἡλιογεννημένην (AB 1356)

“And Achilles spoke to her, the sun born girl”

(34) εὐθέως τὸν παράδωκαν # Ἀλέξη τοῦ Βατάτζη. (CoM H 60)

Lurier (1964: 69): “and [he] immediately surrendered it to Alexios Vatatztes”

(35) ἀπόκρισιν τοὺς ἔδωκεν # ἀμφοτέρων τῶν δύο. (CoM H 3402)<sup>68</sup>

Lurier (1964: 172): “they gave their answer to both of them”

=> “they gave their answer to them, to both of them”

---

<sup>68</sup> Note that this verse involves a light verb; cf. supra 5.2.2.

- (36) γοργὸν νὰ μὴ τὴν πιάσωμεν # τὴν πόλιν τοὺς τὴν Τροίαν. (BT 2495)  
 “[do not think that] we will not take it swiftly, their city Troy”
- (37) Ὡρίσε, μὲ προφώνεσιν # γλυκέα τοὺς παραγγέλλει  
 Lurier (1964: 142-143): “He directed and with sweet appeal he besought”  
τοὺς κεφαλᾶδες κι ἀρχιερεῖς # κι ὅλους τοὺς καβαλλαρίους (CoM H 2453-2454)  
 “the captains, the bishops and all the knights”  
 => “He directed and with sweet appeal he besought them,  
 the captains, the bishops and all the knights”
- (38) Ὁ Ἱμπερίος τὸν ἔρριξεν # τὸν μέγαν Ἀλαμάνον. (IM 426)  
 “Imberios threw him down, the big German”
- (39) ὁ Πάρις τὴν ἐγγάστρωσε # τὴν Ἑλένην Μενελάου (IB 724)  
 “Paris impregnated her, Helen of Menelaos”
- (40) Κάλλιον νὰ τὴν πουλήσωμεν # τὴν κόρην Πλάτζια Φλώραν (PP 917)  
 “It is better that we sell her, the girl Platzia Phlora”
- (41) ἐξακριβῶς τὴν ἔβλεπεν # τὴν εὐγενεῖαν τῆς κόρης. (PP 70)  
 “carefully he looked at it, the nobility of the girl”
- (42) καὶ κονταρέαν τὸν ἔδωκεν, # αἰλί, τὸν Μαργαρίτην. (BT 6862)  
 “and with a lance he stabbed him, alas, Margarites”

Once more, we find strong personal and demonstrative pronouns (cf. infra 5.2.3.3.2):

- (43) καὶ μίαν ἡμέραν δόχνει μας # τὸν Λίβιστρον καὶ ἐμένα  
 “and one day it seemed good to us, to Livistros and me  
 ἵνα καβαλικεύσωμεν, # νὰ ἐβγοῦμεν ἔς τὸ κυνήγιον (LR 3003-3004)  
 “to ride horseback, to go out hunting”
- (44) ἀλλὰ ὡς δούλην ἐκράτει την, # τοιούτην εὐγενίδα (BT 1129)  
 “but he hold her like a slave, such a noble woman”
- (45) ἤξεύρεις καὶ κατέχεις το, # ἐτοῦτο τὸ παιγνίδι (IB 680)  
 “you know and understand it, that game”  
 => “and [he] immediately surrendered it to him, to Alexios Vatatzes”
- (46) Κι ὅσον τὲς ἐκατέστησαν # τὲς συμφωνίες ἐκεῖνες (CoM H 1896)  
 Lurier (1964: 125): “And as soon as they had arranged these agreements”  
 => “And as soon as they had arranged them, these agreements”



(47) Ὁ δοῦκας γὰρ τὸν ἔκραξε # ἐκεῖνον τὸν Ρουμπέρτον (CoM H 2182; cf. 2194)

Lurier (1964: 135): “Then the doge called Robert to him”

=> “Then the doge called him, that Robert”

(48) cf. Μέγαν Κύρην τὸν ἔλεγον # ἐκεῖνον τὸν ἀφέντην (CoM H 2794)

Lurier (1964: 153): “great lord, they called that lord”

=> “they called him great lord, that lord”

(49) καὶ συναγρίδα τὸ ἔφαγεν # τὸ ἐγκόλπιον ἐκεῖνον. (IM 602)

“and a perch ate it, that amulet”

(50) Στὸ συναγρίδιν τὸ ηὔρασιν # τὸ ἐγκόλπιον ἐκεῖνον. (IM 613)

“In the perch they found it, that amulet”

(51) Τίς νὰ τὰ ἐκατάλεξε # τὰ κάλλη αὐτῆς τῆς τέντας; (BT 5951)

“Who could describe them, the beauties of that tent?”

(52) τίς δὲ τὸ ἐκατόρθωσε # τοῦτο τὸ μέγα νίκος. (BT 6874)

“who had achieved it, that impressive victory”

(53) ἐκεῖσε τὸ ἐκάθισαν # τὸ εἶδωλον ἐκεῖνον. (BT 10225)

“there they put it, that statue”

### 5.2.3.3 Functioning: device for indicating topics

It is not only the modern typology of clitic doubling that can be applied to the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry; its modern function as a topic marker can be adopted as well (cf. supra 5.2.1.2). To prove this, I appeal to three arguments: the doubled objects usually present referentially given information (5.2.3.3.1.). This is confirmed by the presence of strong personal and demonstrative pronouns (5.2.3.3.2.). Finally, the position of the OCPs in OV-doublings constitutes further evidence for its function as a topic marker (5.2.3.3.3.).

In order to be able to grasp the pragmatic nuances of the construction under scrutiny, I will take into account only three texts of my corpus (*Achilleïs Byzantina*; *Velthandros & Chrysandza* and *Livistros & Rodamni*, totalling 7289 πολιτικοὶ στίχοι), yet I am convinced that we can extrapolate the results.

#### 5.2.3.3.1 Referentially given

To begin with, it is telling that the doubled objects are almost always referentially given in my corpus and – applied to Chafe’s (1994) tripartite referential continuum – constitute active or semi-active information (cf. supra 2.4.1). Since a logical correlation

exists between referential givenness and relational givenness (“topicality” in its true sense), the fact that the doubled objects tend to be referentially given constitutes an argument in favour of the interpretation of the LMG doubling construction as a topicality device (cf. *supra* 2.4.1).<sup>69</sup>

Table 5 Information status of doubled objects in AB, VC & LR

Total of doubled objects: 241			
Active	69 (28.6%)	Literal repetition (within last two verses)	29 (12%)
		Synonym (within last two verses)	40 (16.6%)
Semi-active	151 (62.7%)	Literal repetition in context (approx. within last 30 verses)	39 (16.2%)
		Referent derivable from context (approx. within last 30 verses)	112 (46.5%)
Inactive	21 (8.7%)		

The categorisation in the above table underlies clear criteria: all objects which have been mentioned in the preceding two verses, either literally or as a synonym, are considered active information. Inactive referents, on the other hand, are neither

---

<sup>69</sup> Indeed, since topics, as relationally given information, are largely determined by the speaker, it seems that we should resort to the concept of referential givenness in order to objectively investigate written texts; cf. *supra* 2.4.1.

present in nor derivable from the preceding context. The intermediate category of semi-active information presents the most difficulties if one attempts to define it in a formal way: as for my corpus, I have decided that objects which have been mentioned in (approximately) the last 30 verses are to be considered semi-active. Objects which are somehow derivable from other concepts mentioned in the context are also reckoned among this category (e.g. tired => a bed).

If we relate the three categories of referential givenness/newness to the attested four types, no striking differences are detected:

Table 6 Relation information status and types of doubled objects in AB, VC & LR

Total doubled objects: 241	Topicalisation: 53	Topic left- dislocation: 110	Backgrounding: 39	Topic right- dislocation: 39
Active: 69	13 (24.5%)	33 (30%)	13 (33.3%)	10 (25.6%)
Semi-active: 150	37 (69.8%)	65 (59.1%)	20 (51.3%)	29 (74.4%)
Inactive: 22	3 (5.7%)	12 (10.9%)	6 (15.4%)	0 (0%)

The results of this investigation are straightforward: in more than 90% of cases, the doubled object constitutes active or semi-active information.<sup>70</sup> As a consequence, we can say that the LMG πολιτικός στίχος confirms the modern fact that “clitic doubling marks the clitic-doubled NPs [noun phrases] as active (given) or at least semi-active (accessible) information” (Janse 2008: 170).<sup>71</sup> I will now give abundant examples. Here, it makes no sense to quote only the verse containing the doubled noun phrase. Therefore, I provide enough contextual information and italicise the relevant passages.

<sup>70</sup> It should come as no surprise that semi-active information prevails over truly active referents, as active information is characteristically expressed by pronouns (such as OCPs) rather than noun phrases (cf. Ziv 1994: 634; Givón 2001: 418; Estigarribia 2006: 133).

<sup>71</sup> Note, however, that this statement confuses the true prerequisite for clitic doubling, i.e. *topicalised* objects, with the indirect yet logical consequence of this prerequisite, i.e. *referentially given* objects; cf. supra 2.4.1.

### 5.2.3.3.1.1 Active

#### *Literal repetition*

- (54) ἀπῆρεν καὶ εἰς τὰ χέρια του # σκουτάριν καὶ κοντάριν.  
“he took in his arms a shield and a sword.”  
Τὸ δὲ σκουτάριν ἐκ παντὸς # τίς νὰ τὸ ἀνιστορήσῃ; (AB 138-139; cf. AB 762)  
“The shield, who could describe it in detail?”
- (55) οἱ Ἔρωτες μὲ ἐφόνευσαν # καὶ κατετρώσασίν με.  
“The Erotes killed me and hurt me.”  
Ἐγὼ πάλιν τοὺς Ἔρωτας # νὰ τοὺς παρακαλέσω (AB 973-974)  
“I again, the Erotes, I will implore them”

#### *Synonym*

- (56) Ἐγραψεν τὸ πιττάκιν της, # πέμπει το πρὸς ἐμένα  
“She wrote her letter, she sent it to me”  
καὶ ἀπάνω ἀντὶ δέματος # εἶχε τὸ δακτυλίδιν.  
“and instead of the string it had the ring.”  
Ἐπέτασά την τὴν γραφήν, # ἐπῆρα, ἐφίλησά την (LR 1745-1747)  
“I took it, the letter, I held (it), I kissed it”
- (57) μέρος ἐπαπειλήσατο ἐμὲν # ὥς συγγενήν του.  
“on the other hand, he threatened me as his relative.”  
Εἶχεν τὰς ἡ καρδιά μου, # φίλε, τὰς ἀπειλὰς του (LR 2428-2429)  
“My heart retained them, friend, his threats”

### 5.2.3.3.1.2 Semi-active

#### *Literal repetition in context*

- (58) ἐψὲ εἰς τὸν ὕπνο μου εἶδα τον # ἐντάμα μὲ τὴν κόρην  
“yesterday in my sleep I saw him together with the girl”  
καὶ ὥς ἐξύπνησα, φίλε μου, # τοὺς ἐδικοὺς μου τὸ εἶπα  
“and when I awoke, my friend, I told it to my men”  
καὶ τοῦτο μὲ ἀπιλογήθησαν # πάντες οἱ ἐδικοί μου”  
“and all my men answered me that”  
Τὸν Λίβιστρον ἐδώκασιν # βουλὴν οἱ ἐδικοί του  
“His men gave Livistros advice”  
ἐπεὶ τὸ κάστρον ἔφτασεν, # τὴν κόρην ἠύρηκέν την (LR 752-756)  
“after he had reached the castle, the girl, he found her”

### *Referent derivable from context*

(59) βοτάνια νὰ ἔχω ἀντὶ τροφῆς, # νερό νὰ τὸ ὑστεροῦμαι (LR 2671)<sup>72</sup>

“I had plants instead of food, water, I was lacking it”

#### **5.2.3.3.1.3 Inactive**

Even in this category of objects containing inactive information, one can doubt whether the doubled objects are truly “irrecoverable” from the context. In some cases, one could tentatively argue that the objects do present information derivable from the preceding context, for instance:

(60) μαραίνει τὸ τὸ κάλλος σου, # νεκρώνει τὴν μορφήν σου (LR 3068)

“it [the constant crying] wilts it, your beauty, it kills your body”

The ladies-of-the-bedchamber of the king who has abducted Rodamni are trying to comfort the girl by flattering her. Rodamni’s beauty (τὸ κάλλος) has not been mentioned in the context and there seems no word present referring to her beauty, yet one could say the concept of beauty is inextricably connected with the appearance of the girl (cf. use of the definite article τό). Rodamni is constantly described in terms of beauty in *Livistros & Rodamni* (cf. the adjectives ἠθικὴν, ἐρωτικόν, λαμπράν, ἔμορφην, ωραία, ἐξαιρετόπλαστον and her quasi-epithet τὴν παράξενον) and her beauty is of course the reason why she has been abducted.

#### **5.2.3.3.2 Strong personal and demonstrative pronouns**

More evidence on the referentially given character of the doubled objects is given by the use of strong personal and/or demonstrative pronouns. As noted, many examples above contain one. These pronouns refer back to the preceding context and can thus be considered signs of referentially given information. The fact that no fewer than 31 doubled objects (12.9%) consist of a demonstrative (autonomous use; first example below) or are accompanied by a demonstrative (adjectival use; other 2 examples below)

---

<sup>72</sup> This example of topicalisation involves a noun phrase without an article (νερό rather than τὸ νερό). The other 4 examples of doubled article-less objects in my corpus (*Achilleïs Byzantina*, *Velthandros & Chrysanta* and *Livistros & Rodamni*) all present cases of topic left-dislocation. Interestingly, this fits the observation made for Standard Modern Greek that the grammaticality of a doubled article-less noun phrase may depend on the specific type of clitic doubling, more specifically, that a doubled article-less noun phrase is ungrammatical with backgrounding; cf. *supra* 5.2.3.2.3.

corroborates the observed tendency that doubled objects constitute (semi-)active information:

(61) ἀπελατίκιν ἔσυρεν, # τοῦτο οὐ ψεύδομαί το (VC 231)  
 “he hauled his stick, that, I do not invent it”

(62) καὶ ταῦτα τὰ καμώματα # μάθη τα ὁ πατήρ σου (VC 1071)  
 “and those deeds, your father will learn them”

(63) καὶ λέγει τας ὁ Βέλθανδρος # αὐτὰς τὰς τρεῖς ὡραίας (VC 602)  
 “and Velthandros spoke to them, those three beautiful girls”

### 5.2.3.3.3 Position OCPs in OV-doublings

A final argument in favour of an interpretation of clitic doubling in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry as a device for indicating topicalised objects is given by the precise position of the coreferential OCPs. We have seen that constituents occurring immediately before the verb can attract OCPs into preverbal position, but only if these constituents – including objects – are focalised (cf. supra 5.2.2). If clitic doubling is indeed linked to topicality, we expect that all doubled objects occur with postverbal OCPs, since preverbal OCPs are associated with focalised objects. This expectation can of course only be verified for those types of clitic doubling in which the object stands to the left of the verb (OV), i.e. topicalisation and topic left-dislocation. Moreover, the examples in which another constituent intervenes between the preverbal object and the verb must be excluded, as this constituent can function as the focus of the utterance and as such attract the OCPs into preverbal position:

Table 7 Position of the OCP in OV doubling constructions in AB, VC & LR

Total of OV doubling without intervening constituent: 68	Preverbal OCP (O + OCP + V): 3	Postverbal OCP (O + V + OCP): 65
Topicalisation: 37	3	34
Topic left-dislocation: 31	0	31

The expectation is borne out: no less than 95.6% (65/68) of the doubled objects occur with a postverbal OCP.<sup>73</sup> However, it is also interesting to have a look at the examples in which another constituent (X) does intervene between the doubled object and the verb:

Table 8 Position of the OCP in OXV doubling constructions in AB, VC & LR

Total of OV doubling with intervening constituent: 95	Preverbal OCP ([X] O + X + OCP + V): 87	Postverbal OCP ([X] O + X + V + OCP): 8
Topicalisation: 16	16	0
Topic left-dislocation: 79	71	8

In 91.6% (87/95) of the examples, preverbal OCPs are found. Often, the intervening element is a function word or a preferential word, which is responsible for the preverbal position of the OCP (cf. supra 4.2.1.2.4), for instance:

- (64) Τὸ κάστρο ὡς τὸ ἔφτασαν, # στέκουν καὶ θεωροῦσι (LR 783)  
“the castle, when they reached it, they stood and watched”

However, focalised constituents too can attract OCPs into preverbal position. This is the case for the examples below: the intervening element constitutes the focus of the utterance. Usually, it constitutes the subject, such as φόβος in the next example:

- (65) Εἰδ’ ἴσως τὴν καρδίᾳ σου # φόβος τὴν παρατρέχει (LR 2789)  
“If maybe your heart, (if) fear passes through it”

However, the intervening element can also exert another grammatical role: I give an example of a focalised predicative adjunct and a focalised attributive adjunct (in the form of an adverb):

<sup>73</sup> The 3 exceptions (LR 3147, 3241 & 3343) all concern ὅλος (“whole”), of which the deviant behavior in doubling constructions has been pointed out: “within the factor reduplicated object, the adjective ὅλος behaves contrary to the general pattern since one finds pronouns in the preverbal position when ὅλος is reduplicated” (Pappas 2004: 72; cf. Condoravdi & Kiparsky 2004: 171ff.). In Modern Greek too, ὅλος exhibits some idiosyncrasies: it is the only adjective which has to be doubled, yet it is stressed like a focus (Pappas 2004: 167).

(66) καὶ ἐμὲ δεσπότην μ' ἔταξες # καὶ ἄρκεϊ με ἐτοῦτο, αὐθέντη (AB 177)  
“and me, as a master you appointed me and that is sufficient to me, lord”

(67) Στρατιώτη, τὸ γατάνι μου, # τὸ τριχογάτανό μου  
“Soldier, my lock of hair, my lock of hair”  
σύρριζον τὸ ἐνέσπασαν # οἱ χεῖρες μου ἀπ' ἐμένα (LR 3750-3751)  
“utterly my hands tore it from me”

Thus, in the structure O + X + OCP + V, which clearly prevails over O + X + V + OCP, the object is doubled by an OCP and must thus be conceived as the *topic* of the utterance, while the preverbal constituent X is responsible for the preverbal position of the OCP and should thus be interpreted as the *focus*. This pattern actually perfectly matches the scheme developed by H. Dik (1995 & 2007) with regard to Ancient Greek, i.e. topic – focus – verb, and thus reinforces our thesis that doubled objects constitute topical information in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry (cf. supra 5.2.1.1).<sup>74</sup>

#### 5.2.3.4 Subtypes

By way of conclusion of this section on clitic doubling, I would like to point to the existence of two related constructions: one which can be compared to topic left-dislocation, i.e. hanging topic left-dislocation (5.2.3.4.1) and one which can be considered a subtype of topic right-dislocation, i.e. repair right-dislocation (5.2.3.4.2). Both constructions show a lack of grammatical agreement between the object and the coreferential OCP: the former with regard to case and the latter with regard to number. Because of the grammatical incorrectness of both the hanging topic left-dislocation and of the repair right-dislocation, I do not think it useful to conduct here an exhaustive statistical analysis: the risk is large that much more of these constructions can be found in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry, but that they have been filtered out by “correcting” editors.

##### 5.2.3.4.1 Hanging topic left-dislocation

The hanging topic left-dislocation (HTLD), which is traditionally known as the “nominative absolute” or “nominativus pendens”, is a subtype of topic left-dislocation.<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> Remember, however, that the notions in Dik’s scheme are not completely consistent: “topic” and “focus” are pragmatic categories, while “verb” is a word class. In other words: verbs can also be topicalised or focalised.

<sup>75</sup> Other synonyms are “isolated” or “unconstructed” nominative (Bolkestein 1981: 65), “independent” nominative (Porter 1992: 86) and “anakoluthischer Nominativ” (Havers 1925: 207).



The most obvious difference between the two is the fact that the left-dislocated object and its coreferential OCP do *not* show case agreement: there exists a “mismatch” (Alexiadou 2006: 673).<sup>76</sup> More precisely, while the OCP takes the accusative (or the genitive<sup>77</sup>), the left-dislocated object takes the nominative. Importantly, the nominative does not really function here as the case of the subject, but rather as the default case, i.e. the form to be found in the dictionaries: “le nominatif n’est pas essentiellement ‘le cas du sujet’ (...) Le nominatif est d’abord la forme de la pure et simple dénomination (...) le cas de la non-dépendance” (Serbat 1991: 28). Let us consider some examples from the case-languages German and Bulgarian:<sup>78</sup>

Dieser Frosch, den hat die Prinzessin gestern geküßt (Boeckx & Grohmann 2005:

132)

nom                      acc

“This frog, the princess kissed it yesterday”

Der Hans, ich kenne ihn schon seit zwölf Jahren (Van Riemsdijk 1997: 5)

nom                      acc

“Hans, I know him already since twelve years”

Toj ne mogat da go prikrepjat kam nikogo (Krapova & Cinque 2008:259)

nom                      acc

“Him, they cannot attach him to anyone”

Like in “normal” topic left-dislocation, a breathing pause stands between the left-dislocated object and the rest of the utterance (Hoffmann 1989: 191).<sup>79</sup> According to van Riemsdijk (1997: 5), this IU boundary is stronger in the case of HTLD: “the absence of agreement tends to correlate with a more pronounced intonation break between the left-dislocated phrase and the rest of the clause”.

HTLD is also said to be more peculiar to informal speech: “Generally speaking, hanging topic left-dislocation is more typical of informal or casual speech, whereas topic left-dislocation is more characteristic of formal or careful speech” (Janse 2008: 170). Consequently, the construction especially occurs in texts which reflect the colloquial idiom (Mohrmann 1933: 21; Svennung 1935: 178). Hofmann (1951<sup>3</sup>: 104), for

---

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Altmann (1981: 23); Krapova & Cinque (2008: 260).

<sup>77</sup> In Standard Modern Greek, indirect objects are expressed through genitive forms.

<sup>78</sup> Naturally, in non-case languages, the identification of HTLD does not make much sense.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Serbat (1991: 23 & 27); de Vries (2007: 35); Janse (2008: 170f.).

instance, calls the construction typical of “die umgangssprachliche Gepflogenheit” (cf. Mohrmann 1933: 21).<sup>80</sup>

The pragmatic role of HTLD is similar to topic left-dislocation. As its name reveals, HTLD also marks objects as topics: it changes the informational status of an expression, since it promotes a non-topic to a topic:

“When a speaker or writer wants to announce a new topic of discourse about which he is going to make some statement, he will sometimes separate the topic from the rest of his words in such a way that it forms a more or less loose beginning of the sentence” (Hoffmann 1989: 185)<sup>81</sup>

It should be noted that even most pretheoretical scholars have interpreted the HTLD construction along these same lines. For instance, pioneer Havers’ (1925) designation “isoliert-emphatischer Nominativ” suggests that he intuitively felt that the hanging nominative exerted a special – pragmatic – role. Serbat (1991: 28; *my italics*) concludes the following:

“Dépourvu de toute fonction syntaxique, il ne vaut donc que par l’information sémantique apportée. En tête de l’énoncé, il [hanging nominative] jette à la face de l’interlocuteur une notion jugée importante et pour cela mise en relief, et à *partir de laquelle va se dérouler la suite de l’énoncé*”<sup>82</sup>

This description closely parallels the modern linguistic definition of topic.

As we could have expected, the HTLD construction has never been made the subject of study in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry. The following examples show that this neglect is undeserved:

- (1) Ἡ Πολυξένη ἡ ἔμνοστη, # τίς νὰ τὴν καταλέξῃ (BT 2248)  
“The beautiful Polyxene, who could describe her?”

---

<sup>80</sup> Accordingly, Halla-Aho (2008: 108-120) has investigated the phenomenon in Latin papyri, while Runge (2008) has taken into account the Greek New Testament, as the language of these texts closely resembles the spoken form. Indeed, despite its predominant spoken character, HTLD has since long been identified in so-called dead languages such as Ancient Greek (Wackernagel 1924: 293; Wannowski 1835; Havers 1925). In Biblical Hebrew as well, HTLD is a well-known phenomenon; cf. Westbury (2010) for further references.

<sup>81</sup> Cf. Slings (1994: 424); Grenoble (1998: 168); Kiss (2001: 1449); Rubio (2009: 205).

<sup>82</sup> According to Svennung (1935: 181), the speaker wants “eine Grundlage legen, auf der der Satz dann aufgebaut wird. Rosen (1992: 251ff.) speaks of the “Thematisierende Funktion” of the hanging nominative; Bolkestein (1981: 65) of the “emphatic” or “thematic” nominative and Grohmann (1997: 1) of the “thema pendens”.

- (2) ὁ ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Ὠλενας # τέσσαρα φῖε τοῦ ἐδῶκαν (CoM H 1957)

Lurier (1964: 128): “the bishop of Olena was given four fees”<sup>83</sup>

=> “the bishop of Olena, they gave him four fees”

- (3) ὅλα γὰρ τὰ καμώματα # κ’ οἱ προᾶξες οἱ μεγάλες,

Lurier (1964: 124): “Indeed, all the achievements and the great deeds,”

ἐσὺ τὲς ἐσυμβούλεψες # κι ἀποκατέστησές τες (CoM H 1856-1857)

“you counseled them and arranged them”

- (4) Οἱ τῶν Ἑλλήνων εὐγενεῖς, # πολλὰ βαρὺν τοὺς φαίνει (BT 5963)

“The noblemen of the Greeks, it appeared to them very heavy”

With regard to my corpus too, HTLD should be interpreted as a pragmatic means to introduce – or facilitate the introduction of – a new topic. Most of the above examples indeed involve definite expressions (often proper names), which usually testify to a (semi-)active information status (cf. supra 2.4.1). The next example even involves a pronoun:

- (5) Κ’ ἡμεῖς, ἀφέντη, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν # ἀπολογίαν μᾶς δίδεις (CoM H 5142)

Lurier (1964: 221): “And to us, O lord, from this moment, you gave us this leave”

Given the nature of the texts under scrutiny, it is important to note that the lack of agreement cannot be ascribed to metrical factors: it is perfectly possible for the author to change, for instance, ἡμεῖς into an accusative ἐμᾶς/ἡμᾶς without distorting the metrical pattern.

Nonetheless, as announced at the beginning of this section, the danger exists that the alteration is made in the opposite direction, namely by the modern editor. Hanging nominatives risk being “corrected” to accusatives/genitives, so as to get grammatically acceptable instances of topic left-dislocation. In cases where the manuscripts present different readings, we might thus expect that the grammatically acceptable accusative (or genitive) rather than the nominative tends to be chosen by the editor. I have conducted a random check of the critical apparatus of the edition by Papathomopoulos & E. Jeffreys (1996) and came across such suspicious verses, for instance:

- (6) Τὴν γενεάν μας πώποτε # τινὰς οὐχ ὕβρισέ τὴν (BT 2321)

“Our house, never has anyone insulted it”

---

<sup>83</sup> In his grammar of the *Chronicle of Morea*, Egea (1988: 93) gives the same example when pointing at the existence of this construction: “Por último, no falta algún ejemplo de nominativo absoluto:

ὁ ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Ὠλενας τέσσαρα φῖε τοῦ ἐδῶκαν 1957”.

- (7) τὸν Μακάριοῦν ντὲ Πιρελέ, # ὁποῦ τὸν Ἑκτωρ ἔκρω,  
 “Makarious Pirele, who hit Hector,”  
 κονταρέαν τὸν ἔδωκε # γεμάτην ἀποπίσω (BT 3486-3487)  
 “he [Hektor] gave him a stroke with his sword, a full one from behind”

Tellingly, manuscripts B and V (the more “vernacular” ones) twice contain a nominative: ἡ γενεά and ὁ Μακαρ(ι)οῦνς (Papathomopoulos & E. Jeffreys 1996: 120 & 182). In the next example, the conjecture even runs counter to the (uniform!) reading of all the available manuscripts:

- (8) μόνον τὸν Ἑκτωρ πάντοτε # αὐτὸς ἀναζητεῖ τον (BT 6995)  
 “Hektor, he always searched for him alone”

Papathomopoulos suggests the accusative τὸν Ἑκτωρ while ABCVX all have the nominative ὁ Ἑκτωρ...

Finally, it might be interesting to note that in modern linguistics the category of HTLD is often more widely interpreted: it also includes left-dislocations of constituents which exert *another* grammatical role than that of object (cf. Krapova & Cinque 2008):

“The nominative, when placed at the beginning of a sentence, may be used to designate the psychological subject even when the construction of the sentence in itself requires another case form (...) sometimes even ἕνας χωριά της, ἐπέθανε τὸ παιδί του ‘a peasant’s child died’ (lit. ‘a peasant (nom.), his child died’)” (Thumb 1912: 32)

In this example, the hanging nominative (ἕνας χωριά της) “anticipates” a genitive OCP του which functions as a possessive pronoun (cf. Svennung 1935: 178).<sup>84</sup> This seems also possible in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry, for instance:

- (9) Καὶ μίαν ἡμέραν ἡ ἔμνοστη, # ἐξόπισθεν τοῦ γεῦμα,  
 “And one day, the beautiful one, after breakfast,”  
 ἔστειλεν ὁ πατέρας της # νὰ ἔλθῃ εἰς τὸ παλάτιν (BT 319-320)  
 “her father sent (her) to go to the palace”

- (10) Ὁ δὲ υἱὸς του ὁ Ἀχιλλεὺς # ἐτρόμαζεν ἡ καρδιά του (AB 132)  
 “His son Achilles, his heart trembled”

<sup>84</sup> Cf. Funk (1961: 280); Grenoble (1998: 167); Alexiadou (2006: 694).

The label HTLD might also be used to describe left-dislocated nominatives that are coreferential with the subject of the utterance, which then takes the form of a strong personal pronoun. As these subject pronouns of course take the nominative case, there is no lack of case agreement. This construction occurs often in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry:<sup>85</sup>

- (11) Φιλιθοῶς ὁ εὐγενὴς # με τοὺς Καλκεδονίτας  
 “The noble Filithoas, together with the men from Chalcedon,”  
τοῦτος ἦλθε καὶ ἐβοήθησεν # Αἶα τοῦ Τελαμῶνος (BT 3886-3887)  
 “he came and helped Ajax of Telamon”

- (12) Μενέλαος ὁ βασιλεύς, # λαμπρὸς ἐκ τῶν Ἑλλήνων,  
 “King Menelaos, brilliant among the Greeks,”  
αὐτὸς εἶχεν ὁμόζυγον # πάνυ ἐξηρημένην (BT 1709-1710)  
 “he had a wife, a very exquisite one”

- (13) Ὁ Ἀγαμέμνων βασιλεύς, # τί κάμνει πάλε ἐκεῖνος; (BT 4302)  
 “King Agamemnon, what did he do then?”

With regard to this construction, it is revealing to check the examples in which OCPs occur. In all these examples, the OCPs are without exception attracted into preverbal position by the strong personal pronoun, which often opens the utterance:

- (14) Πολυβητῆς ὁ βασιλεὺς # τοῦτος τοὺς ὁδηγεῖ. (BT 3390)  
 “Polybetes the king, he led them”
- (15) Ἄλλ’ ὥσάν λέγει ὁ Δάριος, # οἱ Νοθάδελφοι Ἑκτόρου,  
 “But as Darios tells, the bastard brothers of Hektor,”  
αὐτοῖ τὸ ἐγλυτώσασιν # ἀπὸ τὸν Ἀχιλλέα. (BT 5287-5288)  
 “they freed it [Hektor’s horse] from (the hands of) Achilles”
- (16) Ἡ Πολυξένη ἢ θαυμαστὴ # μετὰ τῆς κυρᾶ Ἑλένης,  
 “The marvelous Polyxene, together with lady Helen,  
ἐκεῖνες τὸν ἐδούλευαν, # ἔπλεναν τὴν πληγὴν του (BT 6284-6285)  
 “they served him, they took care of his wound”

---

<sup>85</sup> In this context, one might also mention the left-dislocation of the prepositional phrase introduced by εἰς. This indication of space is then resumed by the demonstrative adverb ἐκεῖ(σε) (cf. Grenoble 1998: 167; Allan 2012: 8):

(1) εἰς τὸν ναὸν Διόνυσου, # ἐκεῖ τὸν ἐφυλάξαν (BT 7283)  
 “in the temple Of Dionysos, there they guarded him”

Other examples are: BT 6278-6279, 11780-11781, 12182-12185, 12552, 13286-13287.

(17) Διομήδης ὁ ἐκλεκτός # καὶ φρόνιμος Δυσσέας,  
 “The exquisite Diomedes and the wise Odysseus,  
τοῦτοι τοὺς ἐθανάτωναν, # ὅλους τοὺς κατακόπτουν. (BT 9794-9795)  
 “they killed them, they slaughtered them all”

(18) Ἐκείνη ὅπου ἔναι ἀσπρότερη # παρὰ τὴν χιόνα, λέγω,  
 “She who is whiter than snow, I say,”  
αὐτεῖνη μὲ ἐσύντυχε, # πολλὰ παραπονεῖται. (BT 9333-9334)  
 “she spoke to me, she complains heavily”

In all probability, the strong personal pronoun thus presents the focus of the utterance which attracts the OCPs into preverbal position, whereas the hanging left-dislocated constituent is the topic.<sup>86</sup> Once again, this pattern nicely fits in with H. Dik’s (1995 & 2007) scheme with regard to Ancient Greek: topic – focus – verb (cf. supra 5.2.1.1).

#### 5.2.3.4.2 Repair right-dislocation

The second construction related to clitic doubling – or more precisely: to right-dislocation – which I would like to mention can be called “repair right-dislocation” (repair RD) (cf. Geluykens 1992). In this construction, the coreferential OCP shows no agreement in number with the right-dislocated object:

- (1) καὶ ἀτοί τους τὸν ἐνδύσασιν # ἐκεῖνον καὶ τὴν κόρην (AB 1502)  
 “and they got him dressed, him and the girl”
- (2) καὶ τριγυρίζει, βλέπει το, # τὸ κάστρον καὶ τοὺς πύργους. (IB 602)  
 “and he wanders around, he sees it, the castle and the towers”
- (3) Ὡς βασιλέαν μὲ εὐφήμεσαν # ἐμὲν καὶ τὴν Ροδάμνην (LR 2247)  
 “They praised me as a king, me and Rodamni”
- (4) νὰ τὸ ἔχη εἰς κληρονομίαν # ἐκεῖνο καὶ τὸ Ἄργος. (CoM H 2877)  
 “so that he would receive it [Nauplion] in inheritance, it and Argos”

All these examples involve a lack of agreement between the OCPs (singular) and their actual referents (plural). As such, these examples seem to point to a corrective function of clitic doubling – hence the term “repair RD”. Note that two out of the four above

<sup>86</sup> However, note that these focalised constituents are all pronominal and thus all consist of referentially given information, which points to the necessity of the distinction relational vs. referential givenness; cf. supra 2.4.1.

examples involve the demonstrative pronoun ἐκεῖνος, which exerts a clarifying role in discourse. As such, repair RD should remind us of the corrective afterthoughts involving verbs (singular) and their subjects (plural) (cf. supra 5.1.3.3). Just like the corrective afterthoughts, the repair RD examples provide further evidence for my interpretation of the fixed caesura as an IU boundary: modern linguists have claimed that a lack of agreement between the OCP and the object is normally not allowed in backgrounding constructions, but only in topic right-dislocations, in which a breathing pause is present (Krapova & Cinque 2008: 260; cf. supra 5.2.3.2). Indeed, the corrective noun phrase is always separated from the OCP by the caesura, which we can thus justifiably equate with an IU boundary.<sup>87</sup> Furthermore, once again, this corrective construction is best explained as the result of the linear progression of orally conceived discourse, which runs from one IU to the other or – applied to written texts – from left to right (cf. supra 5.1.3.3).

## 5.3 Discourse markers

*“una palabra no nace partícula” (Egea 1990: 295)*

### 5.3.1 Introduction: P2 particles from DMs to mere formal fillers?

Now that the study on clitic doubling as well as the study on light verbs has provided further – and especially more solid – evidence for the validity of the focus hypothesis and thus for the importance of the topic/focus pair to describe the language of the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry, it is time to pass to my third and final IS-based concept, namely the phenomenon of DMs, which will receive the most extensive treatment of the three leitmotifs.

---

<sup>87</sup> Cf. over verse-end:

(2) εἰς ὕψος ἀνεβάζου με # καὶ ἀπέκει μὲ εὐφημίζουσιν,  
 “and they lifted me in the height and from there they praised me  
 Χρυσὸν τὸν αὐτοκράτορα # καὶ δεύτερον ἐμένα. (LR 2165-2166)  
 “Chrysos, the emperor, and as the second one me”

Ancient Greek is widely regarded as a language with an extraordinary number of particles, such as γάρ, δέ, γε, τοίνυν, οὖν, etc. (Davies 1997: 49). The standard work is still Denniston's (1954<sup>2</sup>) monograph "The Greek Particles", in which he has conducted a minute study of the Ancient Greek particles from Homer until 320 BC (cf. Black 2002: 19; Páez 2012).<sup>88</sup> These particles can be accorded the "modern" status of DMs: they are active on the procedural rather than on the conceptual plane. As is typical for DMs, these particles serve a multitude of pragmatic functions, such as signalling a topic switch (cf. textual DMs) or expressing subjective emotion (cf. interpersonal DMs) (Bonifazi 2008: 54; cf. supra 2.5.1.2).<sup>89</sup> Consequently, they are difficult to translate, as has already been observed in the pretheoretical era by Smyth (2002<sup>12</sup>: 631; first printed in 1920; cf. supra 2.5.1.5):

"Greek has an extraordinary number of sentence adverbs (or particles in the narrow sense) having a logical or emotional (rhetorical) value. Either alone or in combination these sentence adverbs give a distinctness to the relations between ideas which is foreign to other languages, and often resist translation by separate words, which in English are frequently overemphatic and cumbersome in comparison to the light and delicate nature of the Greek originals (e.g. ἄρα, γέ, τοί). The force of such words is frequently best rendered by pause, stress, or alterations of pitch. To catch the subtle and elusive meaning of these often apparently insignificant elements of speech challenges the utmost vigilance and skill of the student"

Moreover, as Smyth (2002<sup>12</sup>: 631) notes, the particles are "elements of speech", just like DMs (cf. supra 2.5.3.2). Denniston (1954<sup>2</sup>) too maintains that they were not a mere literary phenomenon: Greek conversation was also rich in them.<sup>90</sup>

In the remainder of 5.3.1, I will focus on the Wackernagel P2 particles, which account for a large part of the Ancient Greek particles/DMs (cf. supra 4.2.1). By the time the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry is written, the P2 particles are no longer used in contemporary speech (Jannaris 1897: 400). Nevertheless, we have seen that the poets now and then still insert them (cf. supra 4.2.2). Therefore, I will go deeper into the status of P2 particles in

---

<sup>88</sup> For more recent approaches to the Ancient Greek particles, I refer to Bakker & Wakker (2009).

<sup>89</sup> Cf. Porter & O'Donnell (2007: 5f.); Phillips (2009); Loudová (2014: 157). Of course, P2 particles have other tasks as well, e.g. marking rhythmical boundaries; cf. supra 5.1.3.2 & infra 5.3.1.2.2. Conversely, the class of Ancient Greek DMs is not limited to these particles: it contains, for instance, also adverbs such as νῦν; cf. infra 5.3.2.2.1.

<sup>90</sup> Duhoux (1997), on the other hand, has argued that the particles are more common in non-dialogical texts and therefore more typical of written Greek. This idea has been refuted by George (2009), simply by refining Duhoux's conceptual dichotomy of dialogical vs. non-dialogical texts.



the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry (5.3.1.2). However, I will begin with a broad sketch of the P2 particles' evolution by giving some "anchor points" from post-Classical to Early Medieval Greek (5.3.1.1).

### 5.3.1.1 P2 particles from post-Classical Greek to Early Medieval Greek

Despite their multifunctionality in Ancient Greek, the P2 particles lose their importance in discourse and gradually die out from the post-classical period on. This irrevocable process has already started in the comedies of the 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC dramatist Menander. Especially in comparison with the previous period – in particular in comparison with the classical dramatist Aristophanes – the P2 particles occur less often (González Merino 1981: 164f.). As such, Horrocks (2010<sup>2</sup>: 104) observes:

“General features worthy of comment here include (...) the comparative rarity and frequently odd placement (...) of the ‘second position’ connective and discourse particles so typical of elaborated classical Attic (even, we may note, in the ‘naturalistic’ dialogue of Plato or Aristophanes). While we may safely assume that tone of voice and context could do much in a dramatic interchange to supply the information provided explicitly by particles in a more discursive style, it is surely no accident that the later history of Greek in its lower-level spoken and written forms provides eloquent testimony to the decline of these elements”

This decrease in number goes hand in hand with a reduction in functions (Gonzalez 1981: 167).<sup>91</sup> In the non-literary papyri from that same 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC, the traces of this decline are even more visible (Clarysse 2010: 38ff.). Accordingly, Clarysse (2010: 41) observes that “δέ, γάρ, οὖν make up nearly the full repertoire”.<sup>92</sup> Evans (2010: 200) too comments on the “bad use” of the particles in the papyri.

This process naturally continues in the common era: Thrall (1962), for instance, is struck by comparative scarcity of particles in the New Testament and observes a “divergence from the classical idiom”, which consists of both degeneration and development (cf. Larsen 1991). In the Early Medieval period, then, P2 particles have become a rather rare phenomenon. As such, when discussing a fragment from the 6<sup>th</sup> c. chronicler Malalas, Horrocks (2010<sup>2</sup>: 250) notes their almost complete absence.

Quite dramatically, Egea (1990: 294f.) thus concludes that the history of the Greek language can actually be read as the loss of the particles: “La historia de la lengua griega

---

<sup>91</sup> Cf. Blomqvist (1969); Wahlgren (1995: 95).

<sup>92</sup> In his well-known grammar, Mayser (1970<sup>2</sup>: 114ff.) gives a list of the papyrological survivals of the particles.

desde el ático clásico hasta el de la koiné es, en cierto modo, la historia de la desaparición de estas partículas”.

### 5.3.1.2 P2 particles in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry

#### 5.3.1.2.1 Frequency & variety

The P2 particles have indeed entirely disappeared from modern spoken Greek. Hence, the question arises how the situation looks like in my intermediate corpus. As a matter of fact, the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry shows a very hybrid picture. Although it has been firmly established that the P2 particles had (since long) fallen into disuse in the spoken language (Jannaris 1897: 400; Horrocks 2010<sup>2</sup>: 297f.), the particles – or at least a number of them – still occur in the πολιτικός στίχος poetry (cf. supra 1.1.1.2.1). Indeed, the particles have known a reduction both in frequency (their *total* number has diminished) and in variety (the number of *different* particles has decreased). In my corpus, the particles γάρ, γοῦν, δ(έ), μέν and οὔν are among the fittest survivors (cf. supra 4.2.2 & 5.1.3.2). Γάρ and δέ are the most frequent ones, with 1254 and 805 instances respectively. Μέν occurs 87 times, while γοῦν is found 55 times and οὔν only 23 times. This results in a total number of 2224 P2 particles (on a total of approximately 35,000 verses). In the following table, I give an overview of both their absolute and relative frequency:<sup>93</sup>

Table 9 Frequency of P2 particles

Text (number of verses):	γάρ	γοῦν	δ(έ)	μέν	οὔν	absolute frequency	relative frequency
AB (1926)	33	14	112	9	6	174	9%
VC (1350)	19	11	117	12	4	163	12.1%
BT (14,401)	279	5	362	19	13	678	4.8%
IB (1166)	33	7	11	4	0	55	4.8%
IM (893)	3	7	19	0	0	29	3.2%
LR (4013)	14	5	58	12	0	89	2.2%
PP (1867)	28	6	54	4	0	92	5%
CoM H (9219)	845	0	72	27	0	944	10.2%
Total (34,835)	1254	55	805	87	23	2224	6.4%

<sup>93</sup> To calculate the relative frequency, I have divided the number of occurrences in each work by its length, i.e. the total number of verses of the work in question, so that we acquire the percentage of the verses containing a particle – or the “particle density”.

### 5.3.1.2.2 Functioning

Beside a reduction in frequency and in variety, we can also expect the particles to show a reduction in functions. Thus, the questions arises which roles these relics play in the πολιτικός στίχος poetry. Next to still exerting a pragmatic role in discourse, albeit a bleached one, the particles have been attributed a stylistic, a metrical and a rhythmical function in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry.

*Stylistic function: classicising flavour*

Perhaps unsurprisingly, the “preservation” of P2 particles in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry has in the first place been related to its so-called mixed idiom. As noted, the πολιτικός στίχος poetry – despite its vernacular label – still includes “mehr oder weniger stark klassizistische Elemente” (Rosenqvist 2007: 170; cf. supra 1.1.1.2.1). The ancient particles are considered such a prominent archaising feature, which gives a classicising flavour to the text. Symptomatically, the “classicising” Grottaferrata manuscript of the *Digenis Akritis* contains almost ten times as many particles as the “vulgarising” Escorial version (cf. Soltic, Janse & Bentein 2013: 806):<sup>94</sup>

Table 10 Frequency of P2 particles in the *Digenis Akritis* (G vs. E)

	G	E
γάρ	274	30
γοῦν	1	0
μέν	74	7
δ(έ)	434	43
οὔν	18	1
total	801	81

When considering the texts of my corpus, the poet of *Velthandros & Chrysandza* most generously inserts P2 particles (12.1%). This should not come as a surprise, since *Velthandros & Chrysandza* is normally positioned more towards the more “classicising” end of the continuum of vernacularness (cf. supra 1.1.1.2.2). However, the same can be said of the complex frame story *Livistros & Rodamni* and this text contains surprisingly few particles (only 2.2%). As a consequence, the straightforward correlation between

<sup>94</sup> Politi-Sakellariadi (1987) makes a similar observation with regard to *On Good and Bad Fortune* (cf. supra 3.3.1.1), which has been handed down in an “archaising” manuscript (Oxford) and a “vernacular” one (Leipzig): “αφθονούν τα δέ, γάρ, γοῦν – μόνο στο Ο”.

the relative frequency of particles and their positioning on the scale from “less to more vernacular” cannot be maintained. This becomes even clearer when taking into consideration the “most vernacular” *Chronicle of Morea*, which – comparatively speaking – contains most particles after *Velthandros & Chrysandza*.

However, two remarks are in order: first, we should remember the *Chronicle of Morea* is the only non-fictional text of my corpus, which might have had consequences for the particle usage. Secondly, our chronicler has a remarkable predilection for the particle γάρ, which accounts for almost 90% of the total number of particles in this text. Interestingly, in his article “Graeco-Barbara”, Dawkins (1939: 12) comments on the use of the particles in the *Chronicle*, which he calls a “field for error”. Specifically about γάρ, he writes: “the use of γάρ in the *Chronicle of Morea* affords numerous examples. This particle had long disappeared from the spoken language, yet the author has a strange love for it”. This has also been noticed by Tonnet (1987: 140), who was the first – and at the same time one of the last, unfortunately (cf. *infra* 5.3.2.1) – to deal with the particles in LMG vernacular: “Curieusement γάρ, qui semblait donner des signes de faiblesse à la fin de l’Antiquité dans les textes du Vème-VIème s., jette ici ses derniers feux”.<sup>95</sup> These two scholars do not seem to have considered a possible French equivalent of γάρ and, indeed, I could not detect one. Moreover, we will see that γάρ is distributed in a very awkward way in the *Chronicle of Morea* (cf. *infra* 5.3.1.2.2: excursus). As a consequence, the statistical picture is somewhat distorted: together with the *Ilias Byzantina*, the *Chronicle of Morea* is the only text in which γάρ occurs more frequently than δέ (which is remarkably rare in the *Chronicle*), although δέ is normally said to have held out longest (Tonnet 1987). It thus seems that we should not only take into consideration general stylistics, but also the poet’s personal preferences (cf. Duhoux 2000).

#### *Metrical function: filling the verse*

Beside this stylistic role, the P2 particles occurring in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry have also been attributed the function of “filling the verse”. They are claimed to have become mere verse or metrical fillers:<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup> Tonnet (1987) analysed, where possible, 200 lines of the following four works: a papyrus with private correspondence, 6<sup>th</sup> c. Ioannes Moschos’ *Pratum spiritual*, the 12<sup>th</sup> c. *Prodromic poems* and the *Chronicle of Morea*.

<sup>96</sup> The idea that the particles are (primarily) used *metri causa* is not a new one: the author of the first Greek grammarian, Dionysios Thrax (2<sup>nd</sup>-1<sup>st</sup> c. BC), claims that certain particles are exclusively used for metrical (and esthetical) reasons. However, Duhoux (2000) has proven by statistical analysis that this claim is wrong:

“es muss bemerkt werden, dass die späteren Schriftsteller überhaupt die Partikeln καί, δέ, τέ, γάρ ganz willkührlich brauchen, und insbesondere im Gebrauch des δέ und γάρ sich grosse Willkühr erlauben, so dass diese Partikeln häufig am Ende der Sätze oder Commata stehen und ganz ihre eigentliche Bedeutung verlieren, und im Verse nur im Allgemeinen gebraucht werden, um eine fehlende Sylbe auszufüllen” (Henrichsen 1839: 57)

Korais (1828: 97) confirms that the particles are used “μόνον εἰς ἀναπλήρωσιν τοῦ μέτρου τῶν συλλαβῶν τοῦ στίχου”. However, such extreme statements are not restricted to the times of 19<sup>th</sup> c. philologists: Apostolopoulos (1984: 210), for instance, states: “la présence de certaines particules conjonctives (γάρ, δέ, γε, τοίνυν, οὖν, etc.), privées de tout rôle fonctionnel, ne s’explique que par des besoins métriques”. Egea (1988: 104) has expressed a similar opinion: the P2 particles often appear “sin sentido claro (...) sin sentido alguno, meramente puro relleno métrico o cultismo errado”. In the introduction to their edition of the *War of Troy*, Papathomopoulos & E. Jeffreys (1996: lxxvi) corroborate this view as well: they even say that the P2 particles, which in their opinion rarely have a distinctive meaning, are often “blatant line fillers”. Finally, in the lexicon of Kriaras, the function of γάρ, which is the only particle which receives an entry (γοῦν, δέ, μέν and οὖν are not listed), is described along similar lines: “Χρησιμοποιεῖται πολλές φορές για παραγέμισμα του στίχου”...

#### *Rhythmical function: indicating IU boundaries*

Nonetheless, with regard to my corpus, the particles are not at all inserted at random, which we might have expected if they are really pure-blooded line fillers, simply used *metri causa* in order to achieve the required number of syllables.<sup>97</sup> As the table in section 5.1.3.2 has revealed, the ancient particles are in 97.5% of the cases – and thus almost unexceptionally – placed in P2 in the IU (i.e. after the first word/constituent of the first or of the second half-verse) and thus still obey the well-known Wackernagel’s Law (cf. supra 4.2.1.2.1). Hence, the particles still function as “rhythmical boundary markers”, as Loudová (2007 & 2009b) has shown.

---

differences in particle use should be attributed to personal preferences rather than to the distinction metre vs. prose.

<sup>97</sup> This is, for instance, the case with respect to 14<sup>th</sup> c. “bad” poet Hermoniakos, who has made a versification of the *Iliad* in an exceptional metre: “Hermoniakos goes further and uses γάρ with absolutely no meaning at all. It simply serves to fill up a place in a verse” (Dawkins 1939: 12).

In this context, we should also recall the case study on the verbal unit (cf. supra 4.2.2), in which the particles could unexpectedly help the modern linguist interested in historical syntax: the P2 particles – or rather: the seemingly postponed instances – revealed that the modern prosodic unit between *νά* and the verb (possibly preceded by OCPs) had already been established in my corpus.

*Pragmatic function: bleached discourse role*

As for their pragmatic function, the P2 particles are sometimes said to have lost *all* credit. However, with regard to the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry, this claim is slightly exaggerated.<sup>98</sup> Take, for instance, the particle *δέ*: as in Ancient Greek, *δέ* often signals a (sentence) topic switch in my corpus (cf. Bakker 1990a; cf. *πάλιν* infra 5.3.3.2). Let me give some representative examples:

- (1) Τὴν μίαν Κίρκην ἔλεγαν, Καλίξην δέ τὴν ἄλλην. (BT 13685)  
“The one they called KirKe, the other Kalixo”
- (2) κάμῃ ψηφίσ<η> θάνατον # πικρὸν κατὰ τῆς ὥρας,  
“me, he will condemn to death, a bitter one, immediately”  
σὲ δέ, κυρία, ἐντροπή # καὶ ψόγος οὐκ ὀλίγος. (VC 1072-1073)  
“you, mistress, to shame and not little blame”
- (3) Ἀντίδιος ἐλέγετον # ὁ εἷς ἀπὸ τοὺς δύο·  
“The one of the two was called Antidios,”  
τῆς Γλαύκης τῆς πανέμνοστος # ἦτον υἱὸς ἐκεῖνος·  
“of the beautiful Glauke that one was a son”  
εἰς ὅλα του τὸν ὁμοίαζε # τὰ μέλη Τελαμῶνος·  
“in all his features he looked like him, the members of Telamon,”  
ὁ ἄλλος δέ Εὐρύσακης # ἦτον υἱὸς Θεκμήσης— (BT 12967-12970)  
“the other (was called) Eurisakis, he was a son of Tekmisi”

Nonetheless, scholars agree that the particles’ role in discourse has in general been bleached by the time the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poems are composed. Loudová (2009b: 302) speaks of “an apparent decrease in the variability of particles”. This can be seen both in vernacular and learned works:

“However, neither Blemmydes [13<sup>th</sup> c. literary prose author] nor the metaphrasts distinguished subtle nuances between the particles which, in Classical Greek,

---

<sup>98</sup> For the survival of the P2 particles’ procedural meanings, see Tonnet (1987).

served as an indispensable means for the text build-up and its correct understanding, e.g. they considered τοίνυν and οὖν to be synonyms, whereas in Classical Greek these particles had slightly different semantic values and could not be used in any context” (Loudová 2014: 166)

Specifically with regard to the particles γάρ and οὖν, Loudová observes that they are subject to a process of neutralisation (Loudová 2009a: 193). In the following passage, for instance, it is indeed difficult to define γάρ’s procedural meaning:

- (4) Τέντα εἶχεν ὁ Ἀχιλλεὺς # ἐξαίρετην εἰς ἄκρον,  
 “Achilles had a tent, an exceptionally beautiful one,”  
 ὡσαύτως Ἀγαμέμνονας # μετὰ τοῦ Μενελάου  
 “in like manner as Agamemnon, together with Menelaos”  
 καὶ τοῦ Νεστόρου τοῦ λαμπροῦ # καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν ῥηγάδων·  
 “and the radiant Nestor and many other kinds,”  
 τέτοια ἦτον ὅπου διὰ ἑκατὸν # λίτρας χρυσόν, λογάρην,  
 “It [the tent] was such that (even) with hundred pounds of gold, of money”  
 τινὰς οὐκ ἐδυνήθηκε # νὰ τὴν ἐξαγοράσῃ.  
 “no one was able to buy it.”  
 Ὀλίγον γὰρ ἐφάγασιν, # ὀλίγον καὶ κοιμοῦνται·  
 “They ate a bit, they also slept a bit,”  
 πολλὰ κακὰ ἐσυδάρθησαν, # πολλοὺς κόπους βαστοῦσι. (BT 3200-3206)  
 “they suffered from many ailments, they endured many blows”

No clear link seems to exist between the extraordinary tent of Achilles and the fact that the men are all exhausted (they hardly eat and rest).

Moreover, the fact that the P2 particles seem mutually exchangeable also testifies to their semantic bleaching. Here, the parallel versions of the *Chronicle of Morea* again prove revealing:<sup>99</sup>

- (5) κ’ ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ἐνέμεινεν # ἐκεῖσε εἰς τὴν χώραν (CoM H 1473)  
 Lurier (1964: 111): “and he remained in the town”

---

<sup>99</sup> This seems also the case with regard to other versions of πολιτικὸς στίχος poems:

- (1) τὸ μέλαν δὲ εἰκάζω το # χρῶμα τῶν Αἰγυπτίων (LR 2492)  
 “the black, I consider it the colour of the Egyptians”  
 (2) cf. τὸ μέλαν γὰρ εἰκάζω το # χρῶμαν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων (LR α 2852 = Agapitos’ 2006a edition)

Furthermore, in formulaic phrases in the same version we might also find this mutual exchangeability:

- (3) πολλὰ ἐστενέφθη ὁ Ἕκτορας # τὴν ὥραν γὰρ ἐκείνην (BT 4455)  
 “Hektor was driven into a corner that hour”  
 (4) cf. ὡς ἔποικεν ὁ Ἕκτορας # τὴν ὥραν μὲν ἐκείνην (BT 4791)

cf. κ' ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἀπέμεινεν # ἐκεῖσε εἰς τὴν χώραν (CoM P 1473)

- (6) Ἔζησεν γὰρ ὁ βασιλεὺς # ὁ Λάσκαρις ἐκεῖνος  
Lurier (1964: 103): “Now the basileus Laskaris lived”  
χρόνους κ' ἔτη ὅσα ἠθέλησεν # ὁ Βασιλεὺς τῆς Δόξης (CoM H 1223-1224)  
“as many seasons and years as wished the Basileus of Glory”

cf. Ἔζησεν δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς # ὁ Λάσκαρις ἐκεῖνος  
χρόνους ὅσους ἠθέλησεν # ὁ Κύριος τῆς Δόξης (CoM P 1223-1224)

As mentioned above (cf. supra 4.2.3.4), a P2 particle can also easily be omitted in the parallel version (the loss of the syllable is usually “compensated” by hiatus), for instance:

- (7) Κι ὁ πρίγκιπας, ὡς τὸ ἤκουσεν, # μεγάλως γὰρ τὸ ἐχάρη (CoM H 3242)  
Lurier (1964: 167): “And the prince, when he heard of it, was overjoyed”

cf. Κι ὁ πρίγκιπας τὸ ἤκουσεν, # μεγάλως τὸ ἐχάρη (CoM P 3242)

### ***Excursus: γάρ in the Chronicle of Morea***

Furthermore, the *Chronicle of Morea* shows another peculiarity which can perhaps be related to the bleached discourse role of the P2 particles. As mentioned, the distributional pattern of the popular particle γάρ in this work is very odd.<sup>100</sup> Traditionally, γάρ is said to basically function as a sentence connector in Ancient Greek.<sup>101</sup> With sentence, clauses too are meant. With regard to the New Testament, Black (2002) still cites γάρ as one of the “sentence conjunctions”. This means that γάρ mainly connects sentences/clauses to each other (cf. Kriaras: “σύνδεσμος”):

“the conjunction γάρ only functions at the clause complex level or above, that is, this conjunction is only used to join clauses, clause complexes or paragraphs, and therefore only functions at higher levels and with larger linguistic units” (Porter & O'Donnell 2007: 9)

Γάρ is especially common in sentences/clauses which offer a reason or an explanation and thus has a causal or – a bit more vaguely – explanatory force (Denniston 1954<sup>2</sup>: 58; Smyth 2002<sup>12</sup>), for instance:

<sup>100</sup> This case study on the use of γάρ in the *Chronicle of Morea* has recently been published; cf. Soltic (2014d).

<sup>101</sup> Cf. Robertson (1934: 443); Marshall (1987: 2).



Τοῦτό σφι ἀντὶ λουτροῦ ἐστὶ # οὐ γὰρ δὴ λούονται ὕδατι τὸ παράπαν τὸ σῶμα  
(Hdt. 4.75.2) (taken from Luraghi 2007)

“This is to them instead of washing, for in fact they do not wash their bodies at all in water”

Γάρ, which is typically translated into English as “for”, connects the sentence built around the verb ἐστὶ with the λούονται-sentence. In this function, it can still be found in the *Chronicle of Morea*, for instance:

- (8) οὐδὲν τὸ ἔποικες φρόνιμα, # σφάλμα γὰρ μέγαν ἦτον. (CoM H 3882)

Lurier (1964: 186): “you did not act discreetly; it was an act of great misconduct”

The γάρ-clause gives an explanation of the previous clause. As the two above examples show, γάρ’s status of sentence connector actually comes down to the fact that the IU (= half-verse) in which γάρ is inserted is at the same time the *first* IU of the new (explanatory) sentence/clause – in other words: P2 in the IU *coincides* with P2 in the sentence/clause.

Now, in the *Chronicle of Morea*, γάρ no longer exclusively serves as such a sentence connector. Of the 845 occurrences of γάρ, it occupies 834 times P2 in the IU, yet in almost 25% of these cases (208 examples!), the IU in which γάρ is inserted does *not* constitute the first IU of the sentence, for instance:

- (9) τὸ κάστρον ἐζητήσασιν, # κ’ ἐκεῖνοι οὐδὲν τὸ δίδουν,

Lurier (1964: 122) “they demanded the castle, but they would not cede it,”

διὰ τὸ κάστρον κοίτεται # ἀπάνω γὰρ στὸ σπήλαιον (CoM H 1772-1773)

“for the castle lay at the top of a cliff”

When we consider Lurier’s translation one might at first think that “for” once again renders γάρ. However, it is more likely that Lurier has translated the causal subordinator διὰτὶ as “for”, while leaving γάρ untranslated. The next example is similar:

- (10) “Ἀφέντη ρῆγα κι ἀδελφέ, # καλὰ πρέπει νὰ ἐξεύρης,

Lurier (1964: 246): “Lord king and brother, you must know well”

τὸ πῶς ὁ ἅγιος μας ὁ πατήρ, # ὁ Πάπας γὰρ τῆς Ρώμης,

“that our holy father, the pope of Rome,”

διὰ πλείστων καὶ πολλῶν φορῶν # ἀπέστειλε εἰς ἐμένα (CoM H 6079-6081)

“many, many times has sent me blessing”

As a sentence connector, we would have expected γάρ in the first IU of its sentence/clause, i.e. in the half-verses διὰτὸ κάστρον κοίτεται and τὸ πῶς ὁ ἅγιος μας ὁ πατήρ. However, it is found in the next IU, which respectively contains an additional prepositional and noun phrase (ἀπάνω στὸ σπήλαιον and ὁ Πάπας τῆς Ρώμης).

Apparently, M. Jeffreys (1987: 157) too perceives such a use of γάρ as problematic; he seems to explain these examples by appealing to *metri causa*: “Ἡ αναγκαία αφαίρεση μιας συλλαβῆς γίνεται με την παράλειψη της λέξης ‘γάρ’”.

However, it is fascinating that more than half of the instances (105/208) are similar to the last example: they involve an apposition (ὁ Πάπας τῆς Ρώμης is an apposition to ὁ πατήρ). Here too, the appositions are often accompanied by the demonstrative pronoun ἐκεῖνος, which exerts a clarifying role in discourse (cf. supra 5.1.3.3).<sup>102</sup> Rather than rendering these examples by “for”, Lurier (1964) translates them as “indeed” (cf. Dawkins 1939: 12) or leaves them untranslated. Let me give some more examples:

(11) ὁ κόντος Οὕγγος ὠρέχτηκεν, # ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ντὲ Μπριένε (CoM H 8018)

Lurier (1964: 296): “Count Hugues, that de Brienne, was pleased” [untranslated]

(12) μαρκέσης ἦτον ντὲ Μουφαράντ, # ἀφέντης μέγας ὑπῆρχεν,

Lurier (1964: 73f.): “he was the marquis of Montferrat; he was a great lord,”

στρατιώτης γὰρ ἐξάκουστος # καὶ πρῶτος τῆς Ἰταλίας. (CoM H 209-210)

indeed a celebrated soldier, the first of all Italy”

(13) ὅπου ἀγαποῦσαν καὶ ἤθελαν # νὰ γένῃ ὁ μαρκέσης

Lurier (1964: 95): “who desired and wished that the marquis become emperor,”

ἐκεῖνος γὰρ τοῦ Μουφαρά, # ὅπου ἦτον καπετάνος

“the marquis, indeed, of Montferrat, who was the captain”

εἰς τὰ φουσσᾶτα καὶ λαόν, # καθὼς σὲ τὸ ἐπροεῖπα. (CoM H 990-992)

“of the army and the troops, as I told you before”

(14) [νὰ ἀπέλθουν] εἰς τὴν Κωνσταντινούπολιν # νὰ βάλουν τὸν Ἀλέξην,

Lurier (1964: 82): “to go to Constantinople to place Alexios,”

τοῦ βασιλέως γὰρ τὸν υἱόν, # ἐκεινοῦ τοῦ κῦρ Σάκη (CoM H 488-489)

“son, indeed, of the basileus Kyr Isaac (on the seat)”

(15) ὀρίζουν ὅτι ὁ πρίγκιπας, # ὁ ἀφέντης γὰρ τοῦ τόπου,

Lurier (1964: 293): “stipulate that the prince, the lord, indeed, of the land,”

ὅστις κι ᾄν ἔνι, ὅταν ἐλθῇ # τὴν ἀφεντίαν νὰ λάβῃ (CoM H 7881-7882)

“whoever he may be, when he comes to take up the suzerainty”

---

<sup>102</sup> Again, these appositions nicely occupy one of the two half-verses, which corroborates the hypothesis that we can compare the two half-verses to IUs, for we have seen that an IU boundary is usually present immediately before afterthoughts and that appositions are a subcategory of the class of afterthoughts; cf. supra 5.1.3.3.

In sum, rather than being a blatant line filler, γάρ still has a kind of explanatory force, but is active on a lower level, i.e. the phrasal instead of the sentential/clausal level. Tentatively, this reduced scope can be related to its reduced role in discourse – a reduction which all P2 particles in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry had to endure to a certain extent...

### 5.3.2 New DMs in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry?

Now that it has become clear that the P2 particles in my corpus no longer possess the procedural meanings that genuine DMs would possess, the question arises whether the very useful nuances and subtleties which the ancient particles expressed have simply disappeared altogether or whether their functions have somehow been absorbed by other linguistic items. In other words: does the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry show traces of *newly* developed DMs?

This question reminds of a more general consideration put forward by modern linguists (mainly by those maintaining a typological perspective): do *all* modern spoken languages possess DMs? Are DMs a universal phenomenon? Do all languages, for instance, share the same (basic) set of DMs?<sup>103</sup> Do they, for instance, all have a DM which can mark a topic switch (cf. supra 2.5.4)? If languages do not possess DMs at all, are the speakers then able to express the subtle pragmatic functions normally exerted by DMs? Do the speakers then perhaps express them by other (extra)linguistic means? Or are some languages – or applied to our case: *historical stages* of languages – “less sophisticated”, in that they cannot express certain pragmatic nuances? Schourup (1999: 261) goes more deeply into this issue:

“Do some languages lack DMs altogether, and if so what, if anything, do speakers of such languages do to carry out the same functions DMs perform elsewhere? (...) DMs which mark basic unembellished relations like contrast (or ‘cancelation’) might be expected to have more direct cross-linguistic parallels than do those which mark less basic or more narrowly specified relations or whose occurrence is syntactically more restricted”<sup>104</sup>

---

<sup>103</sup> According to Porter & O'Donnell (2007: 5), the answer is yes. Fraser (1988 & 1990) suggests it is likely that all languages will have DMs like *and*, *so*, and *now*, but he doubts whether this is the case for DMs like *notwithstanding*, *well*, and *anyway*.

<sup>104</sup> Cf. Aijmer & Simon-Vandenberg (2011: 224ff.).

As for the evolution of Greek DMs, the 18<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> c. linguistic archaist Neophytos Doukas answers the above questions in a negative way; he lists the particles among the features whose absence rendered the vernacular Greek of his day inappropriate for the expression of complex ideas (Mackridge 2014: 108). Thrall (1962) too relates the decrease of the particles in the New Testament to the (possible) decay of the whole Greek civilisation:

“Was the subtlety of thought achieved by the Athenian civilization at its height a unique phenomenon which was lost in the Hellenic age? If the subtlety of thought itself disappeared, one might reasonably expect that the means of its expression [the P2 particles] would also die out” (Thrall 1962: 6)

Somewhat further, Thrall (1962: 39) states even more firmly:

“The absence from the κοινή of many of the classical combinations of particles is the most significant example of this process, and may well be a symptom of the more general decline of the classical Greek civilization”

I do not at all agree with Doukas and Thrall: I will attempt to demonstrate that the ancient particles' varied discourse functions must – at least partly – have been adopted by other means in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry. As such, we might expect a kind of compensation for the loss of (the functions of) the ancient P2 particles. I will show that we can indeed find a number of newly developed DMs in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry.<sup>105</sup> Of course, “new” DMs should not necessarily have entered the language *out of the blue*: it is perfectly possible – and even much more plausible given the normal “coming into being” of DMs out of adverbs and verbs (cf. supra 2.5.2.1) – that *already existing* items have at a certain time developed a procedural meaning: beside conveying their “original” conceptual meaning, these items can now also serve pragmatic functions in the discourse, either temporarily or not.<sup>106</sup>

I do not stand alone with this idea: a few other linguists as well have touched upon the issue of – newly developed – DMs in LMG (and thus not only in the πολιτικός στίχος poetry). However, while the enormous secondary literature on ancient particles drives one to despair, with respect to LMG DMs one becomes desperate just because of the opposite: very little has been done, as will be clear from (the length of) the status quaestionis immediately below (5.3.2.1). After this status quaestionis, I will give some

---

<sup>105</sup> With regard to Middle English, for instance, Brinton (2010: 293) also believes that many new DMs have arisen.

<sup>106</sup> Some DMs might indeed continue to exist in Modern Greek.

preliminary considerations on the classification that I maintain for the DMs which I have identified in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry (5.3.2.2).

### 5.3.2.1 Status quaestionis on LMG DMs

Although the pragmatic approach has as a whole missed its start in LMG (cf. Loudová 2008: 1; cf. supra 1.2.2.1), the lack of interest in DMs remains hard to understand, since the loss of the P2 particles constitutes one of the most intriguing developments in the history of the Greek language... Very recently, Loudová (2014: 147f.) has come up with the same observation:

“The studies which deal with this topic are still very few, especially when compared with the parallel situation in the field of Classical studies (...) The existing research in the area of particles in Byzantine Greek has been restricted to several studies”<sup>107</sup>

However, what we actually need is not (only) more research on the use of the ancient P2 particles (whose role in discourse is generally acknowledged to have been bleached, cf. supra 5.3.1.2.2), but studies that look for *new* expressions having developed into DMs. To my knowledge, only two scholars have seriously focused on this issue and have put forward potential DM candidates for LMG: Loudová and Egea.

To begin with, Egea (1990 & 1993) has observed that some words, which already existed yet whose conceptual meaning was bleached, seem to have adopted the pragmatic functions of the older multifunctional particles:

“À côté d’anciennes survivances littéraires (γε, γάρ, δέ, δῆτα, εἰ, εἰθ’, οὕτως, εἴπερ, μέν, οὖν, τοιγαροῦν, τε, ὥς) et d’utilisations continues ou renforcées comme les citées καί et ἀλλά, nous enregistrons les mots qui assument la fonction de particules connectives ou emphatiques comme par exemple: ἀλλά, ἀλλέως, ἀμέ (ἀμέτε), ἀμή, ἄρτι, αὐτίκα, ἐδάρτε, ἐδά, ἔδε, ἐκεῖ, ἐκ τουτου εὐθὺς (εὐθέως), καλά, καί, κᾶν, λοιπόν, μήτε (μουδέ), μόνον (μόνι), μά, μωρέ, νά, ὅλως, οὐδέ, οὔτε, οὕτως, πάλιν, πάντα (πάντως), πλήν, πολλά, τότε, ὡσάν. Quelques unes d’entre elles, formées pendant la création de la koïnè littéraire médiévale, expriment l’emphase (αὐτίκα, ἐδάρτε, ἐδά, ἔδε, καλά, καί, κᾶν, μόνον (μόνι), μά, μωρέ, ὅλως,

---

<sup>107</sup> Accordingly, we must admit that little has changed since Waghlgren’s (2003: 333) remark that there is still much work to be done on Greek particles in LMG texts. Waghlgren (1995) himself has especially focused on an earlier period, namely “der frühen römischen Kaiserzeit” (mainly literary works of the 1<sup>st</sup> c. BC authors of the Early Empire), although he has also written an article on “Particles in Byzantine Historical Texts” (2003).

ώσάν) comme le faisant avant γε, δή, ἤ, θην, μάλα, μην, περ, τοι; d'autres (ἐκεῖ, ἐκ τούτου εὐθύς (εὐθέως), λοιπόν, οὕτως, πάλιν, τότε), utilisées clairement comme particules connectives, substituent les anciennes δέ, τε, οὖν, δή, μέντοι, καίτοι" (Egea 1993: 115f.)

Unfortunately, Egea does not discuss these listed items in detail, so that we do not become much wiser on the precise features of these possibly new DMs in LMG.

Loudová (2007; 2008; 2009a&b & 2014) also observes that other expressions gradually replace the ancient particles:

"the more frequent occurrence of expressions which newly acquire the function of discourse markers is noted, e.g. ἐκ τούτου, εὐθύς, λοιπόν, τότε, and these gradually replace the original discourse markers" (Loudová 2009a: 191)<sup>108</sup>

In a completely different context, Thoma (2007) also touches upon the possibility of newly developed DMs in LMG. In her extensive study on the distribution of OCPs in the 16<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> c. popular prose narratives, Thoma (2007: 143f.) distinguishes between conceptual (namely temporal) adverbs and adverbs functioning as DMs:

"A point that needs to be discussed, albeit briefly, is Mackridge's claim that there is variation in the placement of the pronoun after temporal adverbs. (...) In narrative and especially oral narrative research, one-word temporal adverbials, such as τότε (tote) 'then', εὐθύς/παρεὐθύς (efthis/parefthis) 'immediately/then' etc., are termed 'discourse markers'. (...) Their function is very different to that of long temporal fronted adverbials which give a clear temporal line to the text. These one-word temporal discourse markers show continuity in the same sense that the additive marker καὶ (ke) 'and' does: they add similar, non-exceptional information. (...) Temporal discourse markers were therefore not accounted for in our counting of fronted adverbs"

Indeed, temporal adverbs constitute a field of uncertainty with regard to the LMG OCP distribution (cf. supra 5.2.1.3.1). Since Mackridge (1993: 340f.) has observed that these adverbs show more variation between preverbal and postverbal position than other types of adverbs (he calls their position "relatively free"), the temporal adverbs are usually treated separately. Pappas (2004: 158), for instance, only includes non-temporal adverbs in his statistical overview (cf. supra 5.2.1.3.2). An interpretation of certain (temporal) adverbs as DMs might indeed shed new light on this problem:

---

<sup>108</sup> Note that Loudová explicitly uses the modern linguistic term "DM" instead of "particle" to describe the P2 particles.

“we would be surprised if a more fine-grained investigation of LMG adverbs, based on a syntactically adequate classification, did not reveal different preferences with respect to topicalization and focusing, correlating with differences in the clitic placement they induce” (Condoravdi & Kiparsky 2004: 167)

More concretely, we might expect that temporal adverbs performing a DM function are especially associated with postverbal OCPs, as they lack conceptual content and are thus hardly ever focalised. On the other hand, adverbs exerting their full temporal meaning do have conceptual value and can be subject to focalisation, in which case they can attract OCPs into preverbal position.

### 5.3.2.2 My classification

In the remainder of this chapter, I will investigate some expressions which show DM-like behaviour in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry. Needless to say, I by no means pretend to give an exhaustive list of all DMs in my corpus: I just focus on the most prominent ones. I have divided these DM-like expressions according to their source: either adverbial (5.3.3) or verbal (5.3.4).

My actual discussion will be set up around three levels of grammar, i.e. semantics & syntax and pragmatics: each time, these levels will be considered when examining a potentially new DM. More concretely, under the headings of semantics & syntax, I will discuss *conceptual* examples of the expression under investigation (if available) and give statistical facts on its position. The pragmatic subsection is the most important for my purpose: I will go more deeply into its *procedural* and thus DM-like use. I will also include a section with some general information, which will shortly review previous studies on the (ad)verb in question. In the case of the adverbial DM πάλιν, prosody will even be commented upon, and with regard to the verbal DMs, I will also go into metrical issues.

Before passing to my actual analysis, though, I would like to give some general comments upon this dichotomous classification, which seems justified because of three (interrelated) aspects: beside having a different source (5.3.2.2.1), the adverbial and verbal DMs will differ in their position (5.3.2.2.2) and in their precise procedural function (5.3.2.2.3).

#### 5.3.2.2.1 Different source

##### *Adverbs*

Some of the DMs included in my adverbial class have already been mentioned above as potential candidates (ἐδά(ρτε), λοιπόν, πάλιν, πλὴν). However, I will investigate their

functioning *in detail* in my corpus. Besides, I will innovatively identify a few other adverbs which are eligible for the job of DM (ἀπ'αὐτοῦ, ἐνταῦθα, ἐν τούτῳ).

Strikingly, seven out of eight of these adverbs have a primarily temporal meaning: λοιπόν (“στο εξής, έπειτα”)<sup>109</sup>, ἐδά (“τώρα”), ἐδάρτε (“τώρα” and “τότε”), ἀπ(‘)αὐτοῦ (“ύστερα”) and πάλιν (“ξανά”). Note that the last two also have a spatial meaning: ἀπ(‘)αὐτοῦ (“από εκεί”) and πάλιν (“πίσω”). The same holds for ἐνταῦθα, which is not included in Kriaras’ dictionary, but whose meaning I found in LSJ (temporal: “at the very time, then”; spatial: “here, there”). Neither of these lexica contains ἐν τούτῳ, yet we can infer that it should have meant something like “afterwards/thereupon/after this”.<sup>110</sup> Only πλὴν (“except” according to the LSJ) has no temporal value at all.

This tendency of temporal adverbs to develop procedural meaning also seems to hold for older Greek (Conti 2012b: 50). As an example, we can cite the Ancient Greek temporal adverb νῦν (“now”), which has developed into a DM:<sup>111</sup>

“It is possible that in the κοινή the non-temporal function of νῦν has developed further. In the New Testament there are occasions when νῦν, καὶ νῦν and νῦν οὖν have lost their temporal force and the original temporal adverb simply acts as a connective of one sort or another (...) There is one example in Luke and one in Epictetus where νῦν, in each case followed by a pronoun, appears to exercise a purely inceptive function, in the same way as English “now”” (Thrall 1962: 31)

Moreover, if used as an enclitic (“νυ(ν)”), this adverb hardly ever receives a temporal reading, but has a clear procedural meaning (cf. LSJ: II.1.: “rarely of Time”). Conti (2012b&c) has observed that the temporal adverbs ἄμα and ἔπειτα too might be active on the procedural level rather than on the conceptual (temporal) one in Ancient Greek: these adverbs have become “un medio para estructurar el discurso” (Conti 2012b: 47). Moreover, Jiménez Delgado (2013) as well discusses several temporal adverbs (εἴτα, ἔπειτα, ἤδη, λοιπόν, τότε, ἐνταῦθα) which have become used as DMs in Ancient and post-Classical Greek.

Remember that adverbs – and especially temporal ones – are indeed a word class whose members tend to develop into DMs cross-linguistically (cf. supra 2.5.2.1). Besides, note that ἀπ(‘)αὐτοῦ, ἐνταῦτα and ἐν τούτῳ have at the same time a demonstrative and

---

<sup>109</sup> I have added Kriaras’ description of each adverb between brackets.

<sup>110</sup> In origin, though, it is purely demonstrative (“in this”).

<sup>111</sup> Conti (2012a) even traces the use of νῦν as a DM back to Homer. In the same presentation, Conti also analyses the temporal adverb τότε (“then”) as a DM (cf. Jiménez Delgado 2013).



thus overtly deictic origin, which has also been cited as a property that “stimulates” the entering into the DM cline in my theoretical chapter (cf. *supra* 2.5.2.1).

### *Verbs*

The other class which I have distinguished, namely that of DMs which have lost their verbal value, is entirely underexplored in LMG. However, verbs too are a common cross-linguistic source of DMs, as we have seen in the theoretical chapter (cf. *supra* 2.5.2.1). My section on verbal DMs includes only two (types of) expressions: the first person singular reporting verb λέγω (“I say”; as well as its synonym λαλῶ) and the second person singular epistemic imperative γνώριζε (“know!”; including ἐγνώριζε, γνώρισε, ἤξευρε and πρόσσεχε). Remember that both epistemic and reporting verbs are indeed popular candidates for grammaticalisation. The same holds for second person singular imperatives (cf. *supra* 2.5.2.1).

Again, this tendency also seems applicable to Ancient Greek. The Ancient Greek imperatives ἄγε, φέρε and ἴθι have been mentioned as qualified DM candidates (Biraud 2010: 26). The imperative εἰπέ (“tell!”) as well has been analysed as a DM (Zakowski 2014). From early on, it has received a fixed (“fossilised”) form: the LSJ learns us that the singular εἰπέ can indeed be used to address several persons, which is a clear sign of grammaticalisation (cf. *supra* 2.5.1.4).

In sum, from a cross-linguistic perspective, the development of these adverbs and verbs into DMs is very conceivable.

#### **5.3.2.2.2 Different position**

My adverbial and verbal category will also show a distinctive behaviour with regard to position: we will see that the adverbial DMs prefer P1, whereas the DMs derived from verbs occur parenthetically.<sup>112</sup> However, both positions testify to the syntactic independence of DMs and nicely fit in with the general theory on DMs (cf. *supra* 2.5.2.3).

Nonetheless, of the eight adverbial LMG DMs which I will discuss, one behaves differently, namely the adverb πάλιν, which – in its DM-like use – occurs in P2, just like the ancient Wackernagel particles. However, we will see that this positional deviation can easily be explained, as it is related to the slightly different function of πάλιν: while the other (P1) adverbial DMs signal a change in *discourse* topic (in the sense of Reinhart

---

<sup>112</sup> The preference for P1 also seems to hold for temporal adverbs with a DM function in Ancient Greek, such as τότε (Jiménez Delgado 2013: 40).

1981; cf. supra 2.4.2), P2 πάλιν denotes a new topic in the proper linguistic sense (a so-called *sentence* topic, as opposed to focus) and its scope is thus more limited or local. However, remember that the distinction between discourse topic and sentence topic is best conceived as a gradual one (cf. supra 2.4.2). Both sentence and discourse topic switch markers are a recognised subcategory of the class of DMs, as we have seen (cf. supra 2.5.4).

In parenthesis, we have seen that expressions which are syntactically modified can usually be attributed conceptual meaning rather than a DM use (cf. supra 2.5.2.2). Of course, my adverbial and verbal class will differ from each other on this plane as well: conceptual adverbs will have modifiers in the form of prepositions, such as ἀπὸ ἐδᾶ, and neuter articles, such as τὸ ἐδᾶ, whereas in the case of verbs, it is the presence of adverbs and of arguments, such as the (in)direct object, which point to a conceptual interpretation.

### 5.3.2.2.3 Different procedural function

The precise pragmatic function not only varies between the adverbial DMs themselves, but also differs between the adverbial and verbal DMs, which in its turn justifies the binary division that I have made. We will see that the adverbial DMs are of a rather *textual* nature (signalling a topic switch, either a sentence topic or a discourse one), while the verbal ones tend to function on the *interpersonal* level (e.g. grasping the listener's attention) (cf. supra 2.5.1.2).

However, although Kriaras, for instance, suggests an equivalence between λοιπόν on the one hand and ἐδᾶ(ρτε) on the other (cf. infra 5.3.3.1.3), the fact that λοιπόν, ἐδᾶ(ρτε), ἀπ(')αὐτοῦ, ἐνταῦθα, ἐν τούτῳ and πλὴν are all analysed as discourse topic switch markers does not mean that they are mutually exchangeable. The presumable reason for this is that some core (conceptual) meaning always remains (cf. supra 2.5.3.4). However, going deeper into these subtleties would be too speculative, since it is even almost impossible to pin down the very subtle nuances in the usage of DMs in modern spoken languages. Everybody, for instance, agrees that *however*, *but* and *nonetheless* are contrastive DMs, yet it is hardly possible to predict which one of the three will be chosen in a specific context.<sup>113</sup>

Finally, it should be reminded that it is sometimes even very difficult to draw a sharp line between the conceptual and the procedural use, which is not at all surprising, given

---

<sup>113</sup> Nonetheless, Blakemore (2002: 98ff.) attempts to capture the (often very subtle) differences between these apparently similar DMs.

that the procedural meaning finds its origins in the conceptual one and that both uses can perfectly coexist (cf. supra 2.5.1.3). The fact that we are dealing with a so-called dead language makes it of course even more challenging, as Lyavdansky (2010: 80) states: “I am trying to understand to what extent it is possible to distinguish between adverbial and non-adverbial uses for dead languages”.<sup>114</sup> We should thus not forget that the conceptual and the procedural use are best viewed as being part of a continuum (rather than constituting two strictly separated categories), with the inevitable result that some examples below will be more prototypical than others (Conti 2012b: 47).

Despite these difficulties, I have identified various criteria which may help to decide whether a certain example is closer to the conceptual end or to the DM end of the scale, of which the aforementioned position (P1 or P2 for adverbs; parenthetical position for verbs) seems to be a very important one. Nonetheless, the position is never a decisive criterion, as Loudová (p.c. 17/08/2012) warns us with respect to the adverbial DMs:<sup>115</sup>

“The position of these words in the text can be helpful only partly – the trouble is, that also [conceptual] adverbials can stand at first position in the sentence (e.g. when emphasised) so that we cannot probably use the sentence position as an argument of the first choice without coming into ‘faulos kyklos’”

As a consequence, *contextualisation* of the examples will be indispensable, especially with regard to the adverbial DMs. Thus, rather than providing full translations, I have usually given preference to italicise the relevant passages in Greek and to conduct a short contextual analysis, also because it is very hard to give DMs a proper translation into another language (cf. supra 2.5.1.5).

### 5.3.3 Adverbial DMs

Let me start with the adverbs. I have identified eight adverbs which seem to have developed a procedural meaning beside their “normal”, conceptual meaning and can thus function as DMs in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry. However, not all adverbs occur in all eight texts of my corpus: we will see that some are confined to certain texts.

I have devoted a separate section to πάλιν (5.3.3.2), which is the only adverb that tends to occur in P2 when used procedurally. All the other adverbs prefer to open the utterance (P1) (5.3.3.1). As just mentioned, this positional difference (P1 vs. P2) seems to

---

<sup>114</sup> Cf. Jiménez Delgado (2013: 32f. & 48) for Ancient Greek DMs.

<sup>115</sup> Cf. Goutsos (1994: 174).

reflect a functional difference: signalling a *discourse* topic switch vs. a *sentence* topic switch (cf. supra 5.3.2.2.2).

### 5.3.3.1 P1 adverbs

#### 5.3.3.1.1 Λοιπόν

##### *General information*

Λοιπόν is no doubt the best-investigated of all DMs which will be discussed in this chapter. From the post-classical period on, this temporal adverb has adopted procedural meanings (Cavallin 1941; Blomqvist 1969).<sup>116</sup> More precisely, Thrall (1962: 28), who analyses DMs in the New Testament, distinguishes two pragmatic functions of λοιπόν: it can introduce either a logical conclusion, which we call its inferential use, or a fresh point in the progress of thought, which we call its progressive use. With regard to the former “looking back” function, Thrall (1962: 25ff.) notes that λοιπόν is then the equivalent of ancient οὖν. As such, λοιπόν can co-occur with οὖν, each particle reinforcing the other (Thrall 1962: 27f.; cf. πάλιν δέ infra 5.3.3.2).<sup>117</sup> Tonnet (1987: 138), who concentrates on the Gospel of Mark, is also convinced of an inferential use of λοιπόν, in which case he suggests to translate it as “donc”. The latter “looking forward” function seems a slightly later development, as it occurs far less frequently than inferential λοιπόν in the New Testament (Thrall 1962: 27f.). According to Blomqvist (1969: 102), progressive λοιπόν appears in Hellenistic prose only in papyri.<sup>118</sup>

However, in LMG the progressive use of λοιπόν has been firmly established. Both Egea and Loudová list λοιπόν as a recently developed DM (cf. supra 5.3.2.1). Egea (1993: 16) even gives a short comment on its use: “Λοιπόν: Non pas dans le sens de *par conséquent* (ἄρα, ἐπομένως) [inferential use], mais dans un sens connectif au reste, introduisant souvent un changement de points de vue [progressive use]”. In her analysis of the 15<sup>th</sup> c. Cypriot chronicle by Machairas, Anaxagorou (1998: 76) observes that λοιπόν can produce a shift in subject matter and thus also recognises its progressive potential. Nonetheless, its inferential use has not entirely disappeared in LMG: in his grammar of the *Chronicle of Morea*, for instance, Egea (1988: 105) notes that λοιπόν sometimes means “en consecuencia, de manera que”.

---

<sup>116</sup> Cf. Jiménez Delgado (2013: 37).

<sup>117</sup> Cf. πάλιν δέ infra 5.3.3.1.2.

<sup>118</sup> According to Cavallin (1941), the fact that progressive λοιπόν is absent from the literary and scientific prose of the Hellenistic period confirms his view that it belonged to a popular usage (cf. Blomqvist 1969: 102).

Contrary to many of the potential DM candidates below, which will simply disappear or will only be temporarily active on the procedural level, λοιπόν has survived into Modern Greek (Jiménez Delgado 2013: 37). This is presumably the reason why its development is so well-investigated.<sup>119</sup> In Modern Greek, λοιπόν especially occurs in spoken discourse, as is typical for DMs (Georgakopoulou & Goutsos 1998: 894; cf. supra 2.5.3.2). As regards the current procedural meaning of λοιπόν, the modern concept of topic seems to play a crucial role. Goutsos (1997: 127), for instance, relates the functions of λοιπόν to “the strategy of topic shift”. Importantly, the notion of topic is used here in the sense of *discourse* topic rather than in the sense of *sentence* topic (cf. supra 2.4.2). This remark is also valid for the other P1 adverbial DMs discussed below – only πάλιν, which prefers to occupy P2 if used procedurally, should rather be analysed as a *sentence* topic switch marker. However, remember that these two types of topics are closely linked to each other (cf. supra 2.4.2 & 5.3.2.2.2). The importance of λοιπόν with regard to (switching) topics is confirmed by Christodoulidou (2011: 146), who calls Cypriot (!) λοιπόν a “topic-proffering device”. This actually corresponds to what has been called λοιπόν’s progressive use: a new idea, a fresh point in the progress of thought is introduced. Bewster (1992: 363) points out another related subfunction of λοιπόν, namely a topic resumption marker, which is used to mark the return to the main topic of conversation after an interruption. This is confirmed by Puigdollers (2010: 4.4.):

“El connector λοιπόν presenta numerous usos (...) Uno de sus empleos está asociado a la recuperación de tópicos principales (...) Este empleo de λοιπόν data de al menos el siglo XIX”<sup>120</sup>

Hence, in modern linguistic terms, we would call Modern Greek λοιπόν a discourse topic switch marker, both used to introduce new topics as well as to resume previous ones (cf. supra 2.5.4). We will see that this function of λοιπόν can actually already be detected in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry. Consequently, the last part of Puigdollers’ statement can be modified into “al menos el siglo XIV”. However, whereas in Modern Greek λοιπόν can *only* be used as a DM, in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry λοιπόν can still have its

---

<sup>119</sup> In general, however, studies on Modern Greek DMs are very scarce. I am aware of the following three studies: Georgakopoulou & Goutsos (1998), Archakis (2001) and Christodoulidou (2011). The first and the last one mainly deal with λοιπόν (“well”; “so”), while Archakis discusses δηλαδή (“that is to say”), μ’άλλα λόγια (“in other words”), θέλω να πω (“wish to say”) and ή μάλλον (“or rather”). However, Puigdollers has confided me that he is working on a book on Modern Greek DMs (p.c. 24/04/2013).

<sup>120</sup> Jiménez Delgado (2013: 41) has ascribed the same function to the Ancient Greek temporal adverb τότε.

conceptual, temporal meaning of “afterwards”<sup>121</sup>, so not all instances of λοιπόν in my corpus are DMs.

### *Semantics & syntax*

Λοιπόν occurs 198 times in my corpus. It functions as a genuine temporal adverb if it is preceded by the neuter article τό, which happens in 17 examples, for instance:

- (1) Τί τὸ λοιπὸν ἐγένετον, # ἄκουσε νὰ τὸ μάθης. (LR 2945)

The next 2 examples are similar: the same verb (γίνομαι) is used (“what happened next?”):

- (2) τί τὸ λοιπὸν ἐγένετο # τύχης τῆς εἰμαρμένης;  
ἄς ἔλθω εἰς ἀφήγησι # τοῦ πρώτου μας τοῦ λόγου (IB 579-580)
- (3) Τί τὸ λοιπὸν ἐγένετο; # Φέρνουν τὴν κόρην,  
φέρνουν τὴν εἰς τὸν βασιλιά, # αὐτὸν τὴν παραδίδουν. (PP 67-68)

Interestingly, in spoken Modern Greek, the combination of λοιπόν and the article is rather rare. My suggestion that a functional difference might have arisen between λοιπόν with the article (conceptual use) and without the article (procedural use) is considered conceivable by Loudová (p.c. 17/08/2011). However, the article-less instances of λοιπόν cannot automatically be assigned the status of DM in my corpus. The next examples are, for instance, akin to the previously quoted ones (2 out of 3 contain the verb γίνομαι) and thus also have temporal value:

- (4) Καὶ τί λοιπὸν ἐγένετο # εἰς τὴν ὥραίαν ἐκείνην (PP 128)
- (5) Τὸ τί λοιπὸν ἐγένετον; # ἦλθεν ἡ γραία ὀμπρὸς μας (LR 2782)
- (6) καὶ τί λοιπὸν ἐβάλθηκεν # καὶ κάμνει ἡ Χρυσάντζα; (VC 927)

In the following example as well, the temporal meaning of λοιπόν does not seem excluded, considering the context: after the death of Aias, it is Paris' turn to die:

- (7) τόσες σπαθὲς Αἴαν ἔδωκαν, # χιλιόπληγον ἐποίησαν. (10398)  
(...)  
θαύμασμα μέγαν ἔκαμεν, # οἱ πάντες τὸν θρηνοῦσιν.

---

<sup>121</sup> Actually, λοιπόν is originally derived from the adjective λοιπός (“remaining over”).

Ὅταν τὸ βέλος ἔκβαλαν, # ἐξέβη ἡ ψυχὴ του.  
 Θάνατος Πάρι καὶ Αἴα τῆς Μάνης (10405t)<sup>122</sup>  
 Πάρις λοιπὸν ἀπόθανεν, # ὁ πανεξηρημένος  
 ὁποῦ ἦτον φρονιμώτερος # παρὰ φύσιν ἀνθρώπων. (BT 10403-10406)

A strong means to distinguish the conceptual examples from the DMs is their position: while the former often occur inside the IU, the latter have a clear tendency to occur IU-initially. Of the 181 examples without article, no fewer than 166 are found in P1. To be perfectly clear, with “P1” I will consistently refer to both the verse-initial and postcaesural examples, including those examples in which the adverb in question is preceded by καί, being the coordinator par excellence in the Greek Middle Ages (cf. supra 5.1.3.4). The fact that a DM might be preceded by a coordinator should not be conceived as a problem: the DM then makes the connection between the linked units more explicit than the mere coordinator, which has a more abstract meaning (Crespo 2011: 40). Eideneier (1989: 192) has already noted the tendency of procedural λοιπόν to occupy P1. The inclination towards P1 testifies to the syntactically independent status of DMs, as does the editorial comma immediately after the form in question (cf. supra 2.5.2.3), for instance:

(8) λοιπόν, τὸν νοῦν ἰστήσατε # ν’ ἀκούσητε τὸν λόγον (VC 23)

In this respect, it is even more telling that λοιπόν often precedes a subordinator (59 examples of the 166 at P1), for example:

(9) με̐ πᾶσα τρόπον κι ἀφορμὴν # νὰ φυλαχτῇ ἀπ’ ἐκεῖνον.  
λοιπόν, ὡσὰν ἐσυβιβάστηκεν # με̐ τὸν Φλορᾶν ἐκεῖνον,  
 τὸν πρίγκιπαν γὰρ τοῦ Μορέως, # ποῦ εἶχεν τὴν ἀνεψίαν του (CoM H 8862-8864)

### Pragmatics

Just like in Modern Greek, inserting λοιπόν is a frequently maintained strategy to signal a switch in discourse topic in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry. In our last example above, for instance, the topic switch seems reflected by the editorial right indentation: λοιπόν is conceived as the beginning of a new paragraph. The lay-out of editions might

<sup>122</sup> In many of vernacular manuscripts, titles are inserted (Agapitos 2004: 24). In Papathomopoulos & E. Jeffreys’ (1996) edition of the *War of Troy*, these headings are marked by the letter “t” and put in italics. If these headings are in red, we call them “rubrics”. Rubrics are “a generic characteristic of the erotic tale specifically” according to Agapitos (2004: 24f.), who observes that rubrics do appear in 14 out of the 15 codices transmitting the so-called vernacular romances.

thus also be suggestive with regard to an interpretation in terms of a switch: although this editorial practice does not reflect a true feature of the manuscripts, it does signal that the editors intuitively feel that these verses involve a shift in discourse. I will cite a few other passages which involve a discourse topic switch.

In the next example, for instance, Livistros is talking to Klitovos: he changes the topic from the many journeys and adventures which they have lived through to his decision to marry off Rodamni's sister to Klitovos, so that he would become his brother-in-law:

- (10) Χώρας ἐπαρεδράμαμεν, # πολλές ἀνάγκας εἶδα.  
Λοιπὸν ἐκεῖνο ὅπου ἔταξα # θέλω νὰ τὸ πληρώσω  
καὶ τὴν ἑτέραν ἀδελφὴν # δέσποινας τῆς Ροδάμνης  
νὰ τίς τὴν δώσω σύζυγον, # σύγαμπρον νὰ τὸν ποίσω. (LR 3971-3974)<sup>123</sup>

In the following verses, Priam, talking to his youngest son Amfimakos, dreads the Greeks and urges his people, the Trojans, to fight back, yet suddenly (λοιπὸν) he becomes much more personal and truly addresses his son:

- (11) Ἄν οὐ τοὺς χαμηλώσωμεν, # ἡμποροῦν μετ' ἀδείας  
νὰ μᾶς δημηγερετεύσουσιν, # ὅλοι μας νὰ χαθοῦμεν. (11301)  
(...)  
Κακὸ ἤθελε εἶσθαι, ἐγνώριζε, # μέγα διὰ νὰ σφαγοῦσι,  
καὶ πάλιν πλέον χειρότερον # δι' ἐκείνους νὰ χαθοῦμεν.  
Λοιπὸν φίλον καλλιώτερον # οὐκ ἔχω ἅπ' ἐσέναν.  
Ἐγὼ πατὴρ σου εὐρίσκομαι, # ἐσὺ δὲ πάλιν υἱός μου•  
σκόπα νὰ εἶσαι ἀπόκοτος, # καλός, ἀνδρειωμένος (BT 11306-11310)

Λοιπὸν introduces a new aspect in the ἔκφρασις of the courtyard which Velthandros is admiring: the description goes from the basin (τὸ λουτρόν) to the fountain (ἡ φλισκίνα):

- (12) ἐκεῖ λουτρόν πανεύμορφον, # πλήρης χαριτωμένον,  
τοιοῦτον ἦτον τὸ λουτρόν # οἷον ἄλλον οὐκ ἦτον  
οὐδὲ λαλῆσαι κἂν ποσῶς # ἡ γλῶσσα δύναταί μου.  
Λοιπὸν παρέξω τοῦ λουτροῦ # ἔκειτο ἡ φλισκίνα,  
ώραία, πανεξαίρετη, # ὅλη λιθαρωμένη,  
τὰ ζώδια γύρου περισσά, # λιθαρωτὰ κάκεῖνα,  
τὰ ὅποια μετὰ μηχανῆς # ἐβάστα κάτω κείνη.  
Τῆς δὲ φλισκίνας κάτωθεν # κακ τῶν ζωδίων ἐκείνων  
ἔβρυε βρύση καθαρά, # πολλὰ διειδεστάτη (VC 457-465)

<sup>123</sup> Lendari (2007: 119) observes that the first OCP in a clitic cluster consisting of two 3<sup>rd</sup> person OCPs changes into τίς.



Rodamni is telling Klitovos that she was inexperienced with love (note the negation οὐκ, which is used 4 times). However, this changed when the noble Livistros (ὀκάτις εὐγενής) walked into her life. Λοιπόν makes this switch in subject matter explicit: Livistros is now described in all his beauty:

- (13) ἐρωτικὴν ἐνθύμησιν # ποτέ μου οὐκ ἐθυμήθην,  
 πόθου φροντίδα τὴν ἐμὴν # οὐκ ἔθλιψεν καρδίαν,  
 ἀνάμνησιν οὐκ ἔβαλα # ἀγάπης 'ς τὴν ψυχὴν μου,  
 τῆς ἀσχολήσεως τὰ πικρὰ # ποτὲ οὐκ ἐγνώριζά τα.  
Λοιπὸν ὀκάτις εὐγενής, # ἄγουρος ἀπὸ χώραν,  
 τοπάρχης πλούσιος φοβερός, # ρήγας τῆς γῆς Λιβάνδρας,  
 ὄνομαν εἶχεν Λίβιστρος, # παράξενος εἰς πλάσιν,  
 νέος πολλὰ καλόκοπος, # πολὺς εἰς τὴν ἀνδρείαν,  
 διὰ πόθον τὸν ἐφάντασεν # δι' ἐμὲν ὁ ποθοκράτωρ,  
 δι' ἀγάπη μου τὸν ἔφλεξεν # ἡ φλόγα τῆς ἀγάπης (LR 2923-2932)

Livistros' letter proceeds from general reflections on longing and love (which is metaphorically compared to the branch of a tree) to the two years (τὸ δῖχρονον) during which he and his beloved Rodamni were separated:

- (14) Ἐγὼ τοῦ πόθου τὸ κλαδὶν # θέλω νὰ τὸ ἀνασπᾶσω  
 καὶ λέγω ᾧς ἔναι μετ' αὐτὸ # καὶ τὸ δενδρὸν τοῦ πόνου,  
 τρυγῶ ἐκ τοῦ πόνου τὸ δενδρὸν # ὑπώραν μὲ πικρίαν  
 καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πόθου τὸ κλαδὶν # φύλλα γλυκείας ἀγάπης•  
 Γλυκαίνει ὁ πόθος ὀλιγόν, # πικραίνει ὁ πόθος πλέον.  
 καὶ ὁ πόθος ὀλιγούτσικος # συστήνει με καμπόσο.  
Λοιπὸν ἰδὲ τὸ δῖχρονον # τὸ πάσχω δι' ἐσέναν  
 καὶ δός με τὴν συμπάθειον # μὴ τυραννοῦμαι ἀδίκως (LR 3646-3653)

Λοιπόν can mark the switch from character (the count of Provence) to character (emperor Frederick of Germany):

- (15) Κι ἀφότου γὰρ ὑπάντρεψεν # ὁ κόντος τῆς Προβέντσας  
 τὲς θυγατέρες του τὲς τρεῖς, # καθὼς σὲ τὸ ἀφηγοῦμαι,  
 διαβὼν ὀλίγος ὁ καιρός, # ἀπόθανεν ὁ κόντος  
 κ' ἐνέμεινεν στὸν τόπον του # ἀφέντης κληρονόμος  
 ὁ μισὶρ Κάρλος ἀδελφὸς # τοῦ ρηγὸς τῆς Φραγκίας,  
 διατὶ εἶχεν τὴν πρώτη ἀδελφὴν # ἀπὸ τὲς τρεῖς ἐκεῖνες.  
Λοιπὸν, ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρὸν # κ' ἐκείνους γὰρ τοὺς χρόνους<sup>124</sup>

<sup>124</sup> Note the editorial right indentation as well as the strange position of γὰρ in the *Chronicle of Morea* (phrasal instead of clausal/sentential use); cf. supra 5.3.1.2.2.

Note that “well” – this is how Lurier (1964: 242) translates λοιπόν here – is a well-known English DM (e.g. Schiffrin 1987).

In the following DM-like example, a winged eros is reproaching Livistros for his denial of the god Eros (cf. ἀναισχυντεῖς; ὑβρίζεις), yet (λοιπόν) he instructs him to bend to him from now on:

- (16) Καὶ σύ, ὁ τοιοῦτος ἄνθρωπος, # ὁ ἐξαίρετος ὁ νέος  
ἀναισχυντεῖς τὸν Ἔρωτα, # τὸ τόξον τοῦ ὑβρίζεις;  
Λοιπὸν τοῦ νῦν μὲ ἄκουσον # καὶ κλίθησε πρὸς πόθον,  
τράχηλον κλίνει εἰς δεσμὸν # τῆς ἐρωτοδουλείας (LR 240-243)

It has struck my attention that procedural λοιπόν is often accompanied by imperatives, as in the above example: 53 of the 166 P1 examples have what we can call an hortative character (imperative or incitement by means of ἄς). We will see that this is a recurrent feature of the adverbial DMs that signal a topic switch.

The topic switch function of λοιπόν becomes even more apparent when examining the following examples, in which λοιπόν is used by the narrator as a device for guiding his (whether or not fictive) audience and in which he explicitly signals that he is going to talk about something else. As such, we get a switch not only in subject matter but also in level: from the narrative level to the *metanarrative* level (cf. supra 1.1.2.2.1). In no fewer than 19 of the 166 P1 examples, λοιπόν opens such a metanarrative statement. I give abundant examples:

- (17) Λοιπὸν καὶ τὴν ἀφήγησιν # ἄρχομαι τῆς ἀγάπης  
Λιβίστρου τοῦ πολυπαθοῦς # καὶ κόρης τῆς Ροδάμνης. (LR 27-28)
- (18) Λοιπὸν πρὸς τὴν διήγησιν # ἄς ἔλθω τῶν πραγμάτων. (LR 2246; cf. 2206)
- (19) Λοιπὸν καὶ τὴν ἐξήγησιν # ἄρχομαι νὰ σᾶς λέγω<sup>125</sup>  
τὸ πῶς καὶ τί γεγόνاسι # τὰ τεῖχη τῆς Τρωάδος (BT 1309-1310)
- (20) Λοιπὸν νὰ γράψω τὴν ἀρχήν, # νὰ εἰπῶ, νὰ τὸ ἀφηγοῦμαι. (IM 8)
- (21) Λοιπὸν πρὸς τὸν Ἱμπερίον # ἄς φέρωμεν τὸν λόγον (IM 521)<sup>126</sup>

<sup>125</sup> Note the editorial right indentation.

<sup>126</sup> This verse is identical to IM 598, 623, 710.

(22) Λοιπόν, ἄν ἤθελα λεπτῶς # νὰ σὲ τὰ ἔγραψα ὅλα<sup>127</sup>  
 ὅσα καὶ γὰρ ἐγίνησαν # στὸ σέντζο τῆς Κορίνθου  
 πολλὰ ἠθέλαν βαρεθῇ # ἐκεῖνοι ὅπου τὸ ἀκοῦσιν. (CoM H 2816-2818)

(23) Λοιπόν, ἐὰν σοῦ ἔγραφα # λεπτομερῶς τὲς πράξεις,<sup>128</sup>  
 τὸ ὅσον ἐγίνετον ἐκεῖ # στὸν πόλεμον ἐκεῖνον  
 ἀλάχη νὰ ἐβαρήθηκες # διὰ τὴν πολυλογίαν (CoM H 7031-7033)

(24) Λοιπόν, ν' ἀφήσω τὰ πολλὰ, # νὰ ἐλθοῦμε εἰς τὸ τέλος (CoM H 8833)

Like in Modern Greek, the topic which λοιπόν introduces does not need to be entirely new; λοιπόν can also announce a return to a previous topic. I will now give some examples in which λοιπόν functions as such a topic *resumption* marker.

In the next example, Eros grants Velthandros the opportunity of judging (the beauty of) 40 women. In this passage, he asks three women to come to the front and to show off, as if on a catwalk. After providing some general information on the judgement (he promises to judge accurately and fairly; cf. κρίνω, καταδίκη, κατάκρισιν, ἐρωτοκρισίας), Velthandros again addresses the three women in particular (οἱ τρεῖς):

(25) καὶ λέγει τας ὁ Βέλθανδρος # αὐτὰς τὰς τρεῖς ὡραίας·  
 —Δεῦτε κ' οἱ τρεῖς, δεῦτε ὁμοῦ, # ἔλθατε νὰ σὰς κρίνω.  
 Ἦλθασιν, ἴσταντο κ' οἱ τρεῖς # κατενώπιον τούτου·  
 ὥρισε, λέγει πρὸς αὐτάς· # —Ἔχω τοῦ νὰ σὰς κρίνω  
 πολλὰ 'κριβά, πολλὰ ψιλὰ, # νὰ μὴ ἔχω καταδίκη  
 καὶ πέσω κ' εἰς κατάκρισιν # τῆς ἐρωτοκρισίας.  
Λοιπόν ἐσεῖς, ἀρχόντι<σ>σες, # δεῦτε κ' οἱ τρεῖς ὁμοῦ τε,  
 ὑπάγετε, κινήσατε # ἐκεῖσε πρὸς τὸ πέρα  
 καὶ πάλιν δεῦτε πρὸς ἐμέ, # ἀπέλθατε, στραφῆτε (VC 602-610)

The following example requires more contextualisation: Phlorios is sent to a school in Mondorion. In the meanwhile, his father-king wants to kill his girlfriend (who of course stayed at home, as a respectable housewife-to-be) and envisaged a scheme to falsely accuse her of an attempt to poison himself (the servant being the real poisoner). However, Phlorios, who has disguised himself, arrives just in time to save the girl and kill the servant. In this passage, the unrecognisable Phlorios threatens his father-king to go to Mondorion to tell his son about his evil deeds... The father, not realising that he is speaking to his son, lies that he did not know anything of the treacherous plans of the

<sup>127</sup> Note the subordinator ἄν.

<sup>128</sup> Note the subordinator ἐάν.

servant and then (λοιπόν) picks up the topic of Mondorion, where he still thinks his son is residing:

- (26) καὶ ἐγὼ μισσεύω, ἀπέρχομαι, # εἰς τὸ Μοντόριον πάγω  
νὰ καταλέξω τὸ καθὲν # τοῦ υἱοῦ σου νὰ τὸ μάθῃ,  
νὰ μάθῃ τὴν ὑπόθεσιν, # τὴν ἄδικον τὴν πράξιν”. (746-748)  
[until here, Phlorios is speaking]  
(...)  
καὶ τὸπραχθὲν οὐκ ἤξευρα # ὑπὸ τοῦ σινισκάλκου.  
Λοιπὸν ἐπεὶ ἀπέρχεσαι, # εἰς τὸ Μοντόριον ὑπάγεις,<sup>129</sup>  
χαιρετισμοὺς στὸν Φλώριον # εἰπὲ περιχαρείας  
καὶ τὸ συμβὰν ἀπόκρυψε, # μηδὲν τὸ μολογήσης• (PP 755-759)

Rodamni has finally written a reply to Livistros’ love correspondence. This tempts him into a short digression about lovesickness in general (ψυχὴ γὰρ ἐρωτότρωτος). Where λοιπόν (which again precedes a subordinator) is inserted, we return from “seventh heaven” to Rodamni’s love letter (τὴν γραφὴν/τὸ πιττάκιν τῆς κόρης):

- (27) Ἡῶρα τῆς κόρης τὴν γραφὴν # αὐγὴν ὡς ἐσηκώθην,  
στέκω, ἀναγινώσκω τὴν # καὶ ἀπείκασέ με, φίλε•  
ἔχασα εὐθὺς τοὺς πικρασμοὺς # οὐς εἶχα παροπίσω.  
Ψυχὴ γὰρ ἐρωτότρωτος # ὅσα ποθοπονέση,  
ἐὰν τὸν ἔρτη θεραπεία # καὶ ἡ κόρη τὸν μηνύσῃ,  
εὐθὺς τὴν γῆν οὐ περπατεῖ, # φαίνεται ἀνυψώθη,  
’ς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνέβηκεν, # ’ς τὰ σύννεφα διαβαίνει.  
Λοιπὸν καθὼς ἐνέγνωσα # τῆς κόρης τὸ πιττάκιν,  
κράζω τοὺς εἶχα μετ’ ἐμέν, # εἶπα τοὺς τὴν γραφὴν τῆς (LR 1878-1886)

After a very long ἔκφρασις of the splendour of Achilles, of his horse and of his twelve youngsters (and their horses as well), which is concluded by a rhetorical question (verse 1213: “who would not be fascinated by him”?!), we return to the actions of Achilles: he wants to see the girl (ἡ κόρη):

- (28) καὶ λέγει πρὸς τοὺς ἀγούρους του: # «Δεῦτε, καλοὶ μου φίλοι,  
στρατιῶται ἀνδρειωμένοι μου # καὶ παμπιστότατοί μου,  
σήμερον ἃς ὑπάγωμεν # νὰ ἴδετε τὴν κόρην  
καὶ νὰ θαυμάσετε καὶ ἐσεῖς # τὸ ἐρωτικὸν τῆς κάλλος.»  
[until here, Achilles is speaking]  
Ροῦχα φοραίνουν ὁμοῦ # νὰ ὑπᾶσιν πρὸς τὴν κόρην.

---

<sup>129</sup> Note the subordinator ἐπεὶ.

Μίαν στολήν ἐφόρεσαν # καὶ οἱ δώδεκά του ἀγοῦροι,  
 ἡνάχλια χρυσοπράσινα # εἶχαν ἀπανωφόρια  
 καὶ χρυσοκίτρινα βλαττία # εἶχασιν τὰ φουστάνια.  
 Ἐφόρεσαν καὶ οἱ δώδεκα # στεφάνους ὀλοχρύσους,  
 ὁ δὲ Ἀχιλλεὺς ὁ θαυμαστός, # ὁ ἐξαίρετος τοῦ κόσμου,  
 ἄσπρον βλαττὶν ἐφόρεσεν # μετὰ χρυσὰ πουλία  
 καὶ ἀπανωφόριν κόκκινον # μετὰ λιθομαργάρων,  
 τουβίτσια χρυσοπράσινα # μετὰ ἀετοὺς μεγάλους  
 καὶ πτερνιστήρια χυμευτὰ # διὰ λίθων καὶ μαργάρων•  
 φαρίν ἐκαβαλίκευσεν # ἄσπρον ὡς περιστέριν,  
 καὶ μέσον τούτους ἴσταντο # ὡς ἄστρον, ὡς σελήνην,  
 οἱ Ἑρωτες τὸν ἐγέννησαν # καὶ ἐζωγραφίσασιν τον.  
 Σέλαν εἶχεν ἐξαίρετον, χρυσήν, μαλαγματένια,  
 ρευστὰ μαργαριτάρια # εἶχεν ἡ σέλα γῦρον•  
 τὰ ἐντεληνοπροστέληνα # καὶ ἡ κεφαλαρέα  
 μάλαγμαν ὀλοπόρφυρον # μετὰ λιθομαργάρων•  
 μετὰ χρυσὰ ἀετόπουλα, # μετὰ χρυσὰ λεοντάρια,  
 καὶ χρωμιτίτσια τουβία # ὀξεῖα εἰς τὸ φαρίν του•  
 τὰ ὀνύχια καὶ τὰ κότσια # μετὰ τὴν χινέα βαμμένα  
 καὶ γατανίτσια ὀλόχρυσα # εἰς τὸν σγόρδον ἣν πλεμένα•  
 καὶ κλαπτὸν κομπώσιον # εἶχεν ἡ σέλα ἐκείνη  
 μετὰ φούντας χρυσοκόκκινας, # μετὰ χρυσαργύρους κόμπους•  
 φούντα μεγάλη, ἔμορφη # εἰς τὸ μέτωπον τοῦ ἀλόγου  
 μετὰ δώδεκα φοινίκια χρυσὰ σκουταρωμένη.  
 Ἐδῶκαν τὰ τουμπάκια τους, # πηδοῦν, καβαλικεύουν•  
 ἦτον ὁ ἥλιος πρωϊνός, # Μαΐου ἡμέρες ἦσαν,  
 καὶ ὅσοι τοὺς ἐβλέπασιν # ἐξίσταντο δι' ἐκείνους,  
 λέγουν μὴ ἐκ τοὺς οὐρανούς # ἄγγελος ἐκατέβην.  
 Φαρίου του τὰ λαγκέματα, # τῶν κουδουνίων τοὺς κτύπους,  
 τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως τὴν ἡλικία, # τὸ ἡθικόν του σχῆμαν,  
 τῶν νέων τὰς παραταγὰς # τῶν θαυμαστῶν ἐκείνων,  
 τίνος ψυχὴ νὰ μὴ εὐρεθῇ # νὰ δουλωθῇ εἰς ἐκεῖνον;  
Λοιπὸν τῆς κόρης ἔφθασεν # πλησίον τοῦ κουβουκλίου,  
 λέγει πρὸς τοὺς ἀγούρους του, # τοὺς δώδεκα ἐκείνους:  
 «Ἐπιλαλήσατε ἔμπροσθεν # καὶ διαβῆτε ἐκεῖθεν (AB 1177-1216)

After a short briefing on the attitude of Kantakouzenos (he is both disdainful and arrogant; cf. εἰς καταφρόνησιν, κ' εἰς ἔπαρσιν κι ἀλαζονείαν), we go back to the fact that he is riding horseback. The phrase τὸ φαρίν του is literally repeated. Again, λοιπὸν is translated as “well” by Lurier (1964: 218):

(29) Ἐκεῖνο γὰρ τὸ ἔκαμνεν # Κατακουζηνὸς ἐκεῖνος,  
 κ' ὑπηγαινοέρχετον ἐκεῖ # φημίζων τὸ φαρίν του,  
 εἰς καταφρόνησιν τῶν Φραγκῶν, # διατὸ ἦσαν γὰρ ὀλίγοι,  
 κ' εἰς ἔπαρσιν κι ἀλαζονείαν, # διατὸ ἦσαν οἱ Ρωμαῖοι

πλήθος λαοῦ καὶ πλειότεροι # παρὰ τὸ ἦσαν οἱ Φράγκοι.  
Λοιπὸν ὑπηγαινοέρχεται # τρέχοντα τὸ φαρίν του•  
 τὸ ἄλλογο ἐθυμώθηκε, # τὸν καβαλλάρη ἐπῆρε (CoM H 5068-5074)

In the next example, we also find an almost literal repetition of the phraseology (τὸ μαντᾶτο). After a digression on the activities of lord Champenois (mind the dash inserted by the editor at the end of verse 1510), our storyteller picks up the thread of his story: he was just informing us about the easy circulation of the report (τὸ μαντᾶτο). Once again, Lurier (1964: 113) translates *λοιπὸν* as “well”:

(30) Καταπαντόθε ἐπλάτυνεν # ἐτότε τὸ μαντᾶτο  
 τὸ πῶς οἱ Φράγκοι ἀπήρασιν # τὸ κάστρον τῆς Κορίνθου  
 κ' ἔχουν ἀφέντη ἐξάκουστον, # τὸν λέγουν Καμπανέσην  
 Τὸν χρόνον ἐκεῖνον καὶ καιρὸν # ὅπου ἦλθε ὁ Καμπανέσης  
 κ' ἐπέξεψεν στὴν Ἀχαΐαν, # καθὼς σὲ τὸ ἐπροεῖπα,  
 εἰς τοῦ βιβλίου τὸν πρόλογον, # φαίνει με, σὲ τὸ γράφω,  
 τὸ πῶς γὰρ μὲ τοῦ πιασμοῦ # τῆς Κωνσταντίνου πόλης  
 χρόνον ἕναν καὶ μοναχὸν # ἦλθεν ὁ Καμπανέσης  
 νὰ κουγκεστήσῃ τὸν Μορέαν, # ὥσ' ἂν τὸ ἀφηγοῦμαι—  
λοιπὸν, καθὼς ἐπλάτυνεν # κι ἀκούστη τὸ μαντᾶτο,<sup>130</sup>  
 εὐρέθηκεν εἰς τὴν Βλαχίαν # αὐτὸς ὁ Μπονιφάτσος (CoM H 1502-1512)

Let me conclude with a very simple example, in which Klitovos urges Livistros and Rodamni to hurry up: they are on the verge of leaving the inn in Egypt and of returning to their homelands:

(31) τί τὸν καιρὸν βραδύνομεν, # ἀνέτειλεν τὸ φέγγος  
 (βραδὺν γὰρ ἐπεσώσαμεν # εἰς τὸ ξενοδοχεῖον)·  
λοιπὸν καβαλικεύσετε # νὰ ἐπάρωμεν τὴν στράταν (LR 3569)<sup>131</sup>

Here, *λοιπὸν* clearly helps to resume the story after a short parenthesis (between editorial brackets).

<sup>130</sup> Note the subordinator καθὼς.

<sup>131</sup> Note the editorial right indentation as well as the imperative καβαλικεύσετε.

### 5.3.3.1.2 Πλήν

#### *General information*

Πλήν, which does not occur in the *Ilias Byzantina*, the *War of Troy* and the *Chronicle of Morea*, is another word which – despite its non-temporal meaning – has already been mentioned as a potential DM. Thrall (1962: 24) finds the development of πλήν even one of the most interesting linguistic phenomena exhibited by the New Testament and by the other extant witnesses to the Koine. In origin, πλήν is not an adverb, but a preposition followed by the genitive, meaning “except” (Blomqvist 1969: 75). Its original, conceptual use can thus be called exceptive or limitative: “In Classical Greek πλήν mostly meant “except” or, before complete clauses, “except that” (Blomqvist 1969: 99).

However, from the post-classical period on, it develops procedural meanings, more precisely: it becomes to function as an adversative marker (Gonzalez 1981: 172; Blomqvist 1969: 77). As such, Gonzalez (1981: 172), who studies the language of Menander, reckons it among the “nuevas partículas”. The use of πλήν as an adversative marker has also been identified by Blomqvist (1969) in Hellenistic prose (Blomqvist 1969: 82). Thrall (1962: 20) confirms this use with regard to New Testamentic Greek:

“When πλήν is used as a conjunction in classical literature its force is limitative “except that,” “only” (...) But in addition to this exceptive use, πλήν also develops a purely adversative function, and in this sense it occurs in several of the New Testament writings”

However, πλήν also develops a “merely” progressive function, which might just have been a further development of its adversative function (Thrall 1962: 24). In its progressive use, πλήν (just like λοιπόν) introduces a new subject matter and rather means “moreover” (Thrall 1962: 22; Blomqvist 1969: 88). As mentioned in the above section on λοιπόν, this so-called progressive use actually corresponds to the modern linguistic concept of discourse topic switch marker. Note that one of the descriptions which the LSJ (III.2) gives for πλήν fits this progressive use as well, i.e. “to break off and pass to another subject”. Nevertheless, this use is ranked among the later ones. Indeed, the evolution towards a progressive meaning seems to be a rather late one: “Progressive πλήν, introducing a new subject or a new stage in the description, occurs seldom in Aristotle and Theophrastus but more often from Polybius onwards” (Blomqvist 1969: 88). By the time my corpus is written, however, the progressive function has reached its full extent, as we will see immediately below. Note that πλήν also figures in Egea’s (1993: 115f.) list of potential DMs in LMG, but that he gives no further specifications on its precise uses (cf. supra 5.3.2.1).

## Semantics & syntax

It is telling that πλήν is found at P1 in all the 49 examples in my corpus. In LSJ (III), we find a reference to this preference for P1: “introducing a clause”.

## Pragmatics

Before discussing the examples in which πλήν serves as a DM signalling a discourse topic switch, I want to contextualise some examples in which the adversative meaning of πλήν can “still” be identified. As just mentioned, the adversative function of πλήν should also be situated on the procedural level, yet this use had already reached its full extent in post-Classical Greek and thus constitutes a much earlier development. Kriaras’ dictionary also illustrates this use as the second (and final) possible meaning of πλήν (the first meaning being of course the limitative/exceptive one). The opening verses of *Phlorios & Platzia Phlora* present a nice example of adversative πλήν: the man introduced here has all good qualities one can dream of (cf. εὐγενής, ἀνδρεῖος, καλοπρόσωπος), yet (πλήν) his childless marriage prevents him from being truly happy:

- (1) Εἷς καβελλάρης εὐγενής # ὀρμώμενος ἐκ Ρώμης  
ἀνδρεῖος, καλοπρόσωπος, # ἐν παλαιοῖς τοῖς χρόνοις  
ἔσχε παρθένον σύζυγον, # πλήν ἔξ αὐτῆς τῆς κόρης  
τέκνον οὐδὲν ἐποίησεν # κ’ ἐτρώθηκεν τῇ λύπῃ. (PP 1-4)

In the next example, Phlorios’ classmates, who are on their way to the new school in Mondorion, are all excited, but (πλήν) he does not share their joy (χαράν), because his beloved Platzia Phlora is left home:

- (2) Τὴν δὲ χαράν τὴν εἶχασιν # αὐτοῦ οἱ συνοδοιπόροι  
εἰς εὖμορφα κυνήγια, # εἰς παραδιαβασμούς τους  
τίς ἔχει διηγῆσασθαι; # Πλήν τὴν χαράν ἐκείνην  
εἶχέν την ὥς τὰ σκύβαλα, # οὐκ ἔβλεπεν εἰς αὐτήν. (PP 301-304)

Imberios wants to return to his parents, together with his beloved Margarona. However, he is afraid that Margarona’s father will not allow her to accompany him, so he suggests going without his knowledge: “but (πλήν) let’s go sneakily” (cf. ἄβουλα, μὴν ξεύρη, δίχως βουλήν καὶ θέλημαν):

- (3) Θέλω ἀπὸ τὴν σήμερον # στὲς χώρὲς μου νὰ ὑπᾶμεν·  
κι’ ἂν τὸ μάθ’ ὁ πατέρας σου # οὐδὲν μᾶς θέλει ἀφήσει.  
Πλήν ἂς ξηβοῦμεν ἄβουλα # κανεῖς νὰ μὴν τὸ ξεύρη  
δίχως βουλήν καὶ θέλημαν # πατρός σου καὶ μητρός σου,



ἄν θέλῃς νὰ ἔλθῃς μετ' ἐμέν, # ώραία, ν' ἀκολουθήσῃς  
νὰ ὑπᾶμε εἰς τὴν πατρίδαν μου # καὶ εἰς τὰ γονικά μου. (IM 489-494)

It turns out that the old witch who helped the Egyptian king Verderichos kidnap Rodamni has been deluded by the former: in one day and night, they travel to Egypt, but (πλήν) when they reach the sea, Verderichos leaves the old woman behind and continues with the girl alone:

- (4) καὶ εἰς ἓνα μερονύκτιον # 'ς τὴν Αἴγυπτον ἐπῆγαν.  
Πλήν ὅταν ἐπεσώσαμεν # 'ς τὴν θάλασσαν ἐτούτην<sup>132</sup>  
ἐπαίρνει τὸ καμήλι μου, # πεζεύει με ἐμένα  
καὶ με τὴν κόρην μόνος του # εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἀπῆλθαν (LR 2664-2667)

Achilles strikes up a friendship (ἀγάπην) with the father of the girl with whom he is madly in love, but (πλήν) this “step in the right direction” does not afford him any rest (ἀνάπαυσιν). Πλήν seems reinforced by the particle δέ, which could be used with adversative force in Ancient Greek (Denniston 1954<sup>2</sup>: 165ff.). This might remind us of the combination λοιπὸν οὖν and we will see something similar happening with regard to πάλιν δέ (cf. infra 5.3.3.2):

- (5) ἀγάπην ἐπεζήτησεν # μετὰ πατρός ἐκείνης.  
Ἐποίησεν ἀγάπην. (title)  
Πολλάκις συνεσμίγουντα # καὶ συνεπεριπατοῦσαν  
ἡμέραν νύκταν ἄπασαν # καὶ νύκτας καὶ ἡμέρας,  
πλήν δὲ ποσῶς ἀνάπαυσιν # ὁ Ἀχιλλεὺς οὐκ εἶχεν.  
Ποσῶς ἀνάπαυσιν ὁ Ἀχιλλεὺς οὐκ εἶχεν. (title) (AB 898-901)

The king had spread messages that he was selling an extraordinarily beautiful girl and proposes the merchants that they could have her in exchange for a high amount of money. Although this deal pleases them, the traders first want to see proof (“seeing is believing”!). Πλήν denotes the opposition between telling (λέγετε, ἀφηγάσθε) and seeing (ἴδωμεν):

- (6) Ἀρέσει μας ἡ πραγματεία # αὐτὴ τὴν ἐπαινεῖται  
ἄν ἔναι ὥσάν λέγετε # καὶ ὥσάν τὸ ἀφηγάσθε.  
Πλήν πρῶτον νὰ τὴν ἴδωμεν # θέλομεν τὴν ώραία  
καὶ ἄν ἔναι ἡ κόρη φρόνιμος, # καὶ ἄν ἔναι ὠραιωμένη (PP 952-955)

---

<sup>132</sup> Note the subordinator ὅταν.

Let me now continue with the examples in which the adversative force of *πλήν* has been weakened: it has developed a “merely” progressive meaning and has thus become discourse topic switch marker, to use the modern linguistic designation. This function reaches its full extent in my corpus. Consider, for instance, the next verses, in which *πλήν* signals the switch from the letter (*τὴν γραφήν*) to the ring (*δακτυλίδιν*) which was included in the letter. The ring is then described in detail:

- (7) Ἔγραψα, φίλε, τὴν γραφήν, # πάλιν ἐτόξευσά την  
καὶ πάλιν τὸ τεντόσκοινον # ἐκράτουν καὶ ἐμελέτουν  
πότε νὰ εὗρουν τὴν γραφήν # καὶ νὰ τὴν ἀναγνώσουν.  
Πλήν τοῦτο τὸ πιττάκι μου # καὶ δακτυλίδιν εἶχε.  
Εἶχε λιθάριν, φίλε μου, # καθάριον λυχνιτάριν•  
εἶχεν ἀπέσω σίδερον # καὶ ἀπέκει τὸν μαγνήτην  
καὶ μέσα ἀντὶ δέματος # τοῦ σιδηρομαγνήτου  
μάλαγμαν εἶχεν ἄδολον, # μυριολαγαρισμένο. (LR 1705-1712)

Coincidentally, the following example also concerns a ring. We proceed from the sadness at the lovers’ separation (cf. ἐθρηνήσασιν, στενάγματα καὶ πόνους, θλίψιν) to the ring (*δακτυλίδι*) which Platzia Phlora gives to Phlorios. Again, this ring is then extensively described:

- (8) Κατὰ τὴν ἀποχώρησιν # τῶν ἀμφοτέρων παίδων  
ἀλλήλως ἐθρηνήσασιν, # συχνῶς ἐπεριλάβαν  
καὶ ὁ εἰς τὸν ἄλλον ἄφηκε # στενάγματα καὶ πόνους  
καὶ θλίψιν νὰ διχοτομῇ # τὴν καθενὸς καρδίαν•  
πλήν δακτυλίδι ἐρωτικὸν # ἡ κόρη τὸν ἐδῶκεν,  
ἐκεῖνο τὸ ἐκονόμησεν # ἡ τέχνη τῶν ἐρώτων  
καὶ ἡ χάρις τὸ ἐκόσμησεν # κ’ ἐποϊκὲν το τοιοῦτον  
πῶς νὰ δείχνῃ ἐνέργειαν # εἰς ἐρωτοποθοῦντας.  
Τὰ λόγια του τὰ ἔλεγεν # ἄκουσον νὰ τὰ μάθῃς:  
“Ἐπαρ’ τὸ δακτυλίδι μου # καὶ βάστα το μ’ ἐσένα.  
Ζάφειρος ἔν’ ὁ λίθος του, # εὐγενικὸν ὑπάρχει,  
ἔμορφον ἔνι, ἐξαίρετον, # ἔχε το ἀντὶ ἐμένα  
καὶ ἐὰν τι εἰς ἐμὲ συμβῇ, # ἐνάντιον νὰ γένη,  
αὐτὸ τὸ δακτυλίδι μου # νὰ θλίβεται δι’ ἐμένα,  
ὁ λίθος νὰ θαμπώνεται, # νὰ χάνεται ἡ θεωριά του  
καὶ ἀπ’ αὐτο νὰ ἔχῃς εἶδησιν # ὅτι ἐγὼ θλιβοῦμαι”. (PP 269-284)

The next example concerns another gift. The mother of Imberios bids her son farewell: after her blessings (ἡ εὐχή), she begins talking about her goodbye-present, i.e. a talisman (ἐγκόλπιον) which holds the promise to protect him against all evils during his travelling. Once again, *πλήν* helps to introduce this new topic:

- (9) ἄπελθε τοίνυν, ἄπελθε, # υἱέ μου, στήν εὐχήν μου  
καὶ ὁ ἐπουράνιος βασιλεὺς # νὰ ἔναι μετ' ἐσένα  
καὶ ἡ εὐχή τῆς ἄπορος, # τῆς ταπεινῆς μητρός σου  
νὰ σκέπη σε εἰς τὴν ξενιτειάν, # συντόμως νὰ γυρίσης.  
Πλήν ἀκριβὸν ἐγκόλπιον # δίδω σε νὰ βαστάζης  
καὶ ὥστε τὸ ἐγκόλπιον # βαστᾷς το μετ' ἐσένα,  
ποτὲ θανάτου συμφορὰν, # ποτὲ μηδὲν φοβᾶσαι•  
οὐδὲ κοντάριν δύναται # ποσῶς νὰ σὲ φονεύση,  
οὐδὲ ἰστία οὐδὲ νερόν, # ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἀπὸ ξίφους. (IM 225-233)

After giving some practical information on the inn (“we have a bathing place, etc.”), Rodamni suddenly wants to ask her guest a few questions (in the hope that he can learn her more about her lost love Livistros):

- (10) Λέγει με ἡ ξενοδόχισσα: # «Δῆσε τὸ ἄλογόν σου•  
ἔναι καὶ στάβλος καὶ μονὴ # καὶ ἀνάπαυση ὡς θέλεις,  
ἔναι λουτρὸν καὶ νὰ λουθῇς # καὶ νὰ σὲ κυβερνήσω.  
Πλήν ζήτημα θέλω ἀπ' ἐσέν, # ζητῶ, παρακαλῶ το•  
εἰς τὰ σὲ θέλω ἐρωτᾶν, # ἂν ξεύρης δι' ἐκεῖνα (LR 2870-2875)

The next example is somewhat similar. Margarona, now serving in a local hospital, is very curious about her attractive new patient (who will turn out to be her “high-school sweetheart” Imberios!). She articulates the hope that he will recover soon from his illness (λυτρωθῆς συντόμως) and then (πλήν) switches to the request to provide her with some “autobiographical” information (cf. questions: ἀπὸ πόθεν εἶσαι, ἀπὸ ποῦ ἐγεννήθηκες, ποῦ 'ν' τὰ γονικά σου, χώρας ποίας, ποταπῆς καὶ γενεᾶς ὑπάρχεις):

- (11) «Ἡμεῖς μὲ δύναμιν Θεοῦ # θεωροῦμεν εἰς ἐσέναν  
ὅτι πλέον ἀσθένειαν # οὐκ ἔχεις, οὐδὲ πάθος,  
ἀλλὰ θαρροῦμεν σύντομα # εἰς Θεὸν τὸν παντοκράτωρ  
ἀσθένειαν ποὺ σ' ἔτυχεν # νὰ λυτρωθῇς συντόμως.  
Πλήν λέγω καὶ παρακαλῶ, # ἀλλότριε καὶ ξένε,  
νὰ πῆς καὶ νὰ ἀφηγηθῇς # τὸ ἀπὸ πόθεν εἶσαι,  
τὸ ἀπὸ ποῦ ἐγεννήθηκες # καὶ ποῦ 'ν' τὰ γονικά σου  
καὶ χώρας ποίας, ποταπῆς # καὶ γενεᾶς ὑπάρχεις  
νὰ ξεύρωμεν νὰ γράφωμεν, # ξένε, καὶ πρὸς ἐσέναν». (IM 756-764)

In the next passage, we are amid the ἔκφρασις of the Silvercastle and our storyteller has just (verse 2253) announced that he will concentrate on the pool (ἡ βισκίνα), which is for a large part constructed out of glass (τὸ ὑαλίν). Here, he zooms in (πλήν) on the quality of the glass: it is wholly polished (ὁλολαγαρισμένο) and it is even called “(ice)crystal” (κρύσταλλον), because of its clearness (διὰ τὴν ἐξασπρίαν). This short

digression is closed off in verse 2265 (οὕτως...). In the next verse, he then proceeds with other aspects concerning the pool, beginning with the palm (κουκουνάρα):

- (12) Καὶ εἰς τὸ μέσον ἔστεκεν # ὑάλινος βισκίνα,  
τὸ πάτωμα καὶ ἡ κτίσις τῆς # ὅλη γυαλὶ νὰ ἦτον,  
πλήν τοιοῦτον ἦτον, # φίλε μου, τὸ ὑαλὶν ἐκεῖνο  
ὡς ἔν' τὸ κρύον τὸ καθαρὸν, # τὸ ὀλολαγαρισμένο  
καὶ κρύσταλλον τὸ λέγουσιν # διὰ τὴν ἑξασπρίαν,  
οὕτως ἦτον τὸ γυαλὶν # ἐκείνης τῆς βισκίνας.  
Μέσον εἰς αὐτὴν ἔστεκεν # πράσινη κουκουνάρα (LR 2260-2266)

In his quest for Platzia Phloria, Phlorios asks an innkeeper for further information on his darling, whereupon he vividly describes her sadness (θλιμμένη περισσά, καμένη, πονεμένη, νὰ κλαίῃ καὶ τὰ δάκρυα τῆς νὰ τρέχουν ὡς ποτάμι, νὰ ἀναστενάζῃ ἀπὸ ψυχῆς, νὰ στριγγίζῃ ἀπὸ καρδιᾶς) and then (πλήν) goes on with the fact that her abductors have taken her to Egypt (τῆς Αἰγύπτου):

- (13) Καὶ ὁ ξενοδόχος παρευθὺς # τὸν Φλώριον ἐλάλει:  
“Φλώριε, μὰ τὴν πίστην μας, # ἀλήθειαν σὲ λέγω.  
προχθὲς ἐξενοδόχησα κόρην # τὴν Πλάτζια Φλώρα  
νὰ ἔναι θλιμμένη περισσά, # καμένη, πονεμένη,  
νὰ κλαίῃ καὶ τὰ δάκρυα τῆς # νὰ τρέχουν ὡς ποτάμι,  
νὰ ἀναστενάζῃ ἀπὸ ψυχῆς, # νὰ ἐνθυμᾶται ἐσένα  
καὶ νὰ στριγγίζῃ ἀπὸ καρδιᾶς, # νὰ λέγῃ τὸ ὄνομά σου.  
Πλήν τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἐπέρασαν, # ὑπᾶν διὰ θαλάσσης”. (PP 1265-1272)

In the next, metanarrative passage, the author rhetorically asks who is able to tell about the enormous joy (τὴν εὐθυμίαν καὶ τὴν χαρὰν) which Livistros and his 100 comrades share when they see each other again. He then (πλήν) proceeds by saying that he will tell a part (μέρος) of it... Note that the editor inserts a dash, which points to a break in the discourse:

- (14) Τίς ἢ μπορεῖ νὰ διηγηθῇ # καταλεπτὸν ἐκείνην  
τὴν εὐθυμίαν καὶ τὴν χαρὰν # τὴν εἶχαν πρὸς ἀλλήλων  
—πλήν βούλομαι νὰ διηγηθῶ # μέρος ἀπὲ τὰ ὅλα. (LR 3845-3847)

Πλήν once also introduces a parenthetical insertion. In the following example, Rodamni's eunuch secretly gives advice to Livistros (“write her some more letters; eventually she will yield!”): while the whole passage *specifically* deals with Rodamni's feelings (ἡ κόρη; cf. verbs in 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular), the verse between parentheses, which πλήν opens, makes a remark about attractive women *in general* (“they always play hard-to-get”; οἱ ὥραῖες; cf. verbs in 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural):

- (15) καὶ μάθε, διὰ τὸν πόθο σου # ἡ κόρη ἀναστενάζει  
καὶ ἀγάπην σου ἐπαρέλαβεν # καὶ πάσχει δι' ἐσέναν  
—πλήν οἱ ὠραῖες ἔχουν το, # τὸ νὰ κενοδοξοῦσιν—  
καὶ μάλιστα ἐὰν οὐκ ἔπесεν # εἰς ἔρωτος ἀγάπην,  
κρατίεται ἀσυγκατάβατος # καὶ σύντομα οὐ κλίνει.  
Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο συνεχῶς # γράφε, μὴ ἀμελῇς το (LR 1443-1448)

It should have become clear that a strongly adversative interpretation of the above instances does not make much sense. Rather, we should analyse *πλήν* as a discourse topic switch marker.

### 5.3.3.1.3 Ἐδά(ρτε)

#### *General information*

The next adverb which I will analyse is *ἐδά*, which does not occur in the *Achilleïs Byzantina*, the *Ilias Byzantina* and *Imberios & Margarona*. *Ἐδά* is mentioned on Egea's list as a potential new DM, yet again without any explanations (cf. supra 5.3.2.1).

#### *Semantics & syntax*

In some instances in my corpus, *ἐδά* exerts its full conceptual, i.e. temporal, meaning ("now"), as in the 2 examples in which it is preceded by a preposition:

- (1) ἀδιάκριτος μηδὲν γενῆς # σ' ἐμὲν τὸ ξενωμένον,  
ὅτι ἀπὸ ἐδά συνέχει με # ὁ πόνος τῆς ἀγάπης.  
Ποῖσε νὰ ἰδῶ, αὐθέντη μου, # εἰς πρόσωπον τὴν κόρην (PP 1552-1554)
- (2) ἀπὸ ἕναν διάβολον, # ὅπου μᾶς ἐπολέμα•  
ἐὰν εἴχε ζῆ ἔως ἐδά, # ἤμεθεν νικημένοι. (BT 5309-5310)

The same applies to the sole example in which the neuter article accompanies the adverb:

- (3) Λέγει: «Οὐκ ἠξεύρω τίποτε, # μόνον τὸ ἐδά καὶ μόνον  
ἐξέβην ἄρτι ἀπ' αὐτόν, # ἔρχεται ἐδῶ, πιστεύω. (BT 14248-14249)

#### *Pragmatics*

Tellingly, of the 111 remaining examples, no fewer than 95 are found in P1, in which case a procedural interpretation becomes much more likely. Just like *λοιπόν* and *πλήν*, *ἐδά* too can signal a switch in discourse topic. Interestingly, Kriaras translates *ἐδά* as Modern Greek *λοιπόν* (5<sup>th</sup> point in the lemma). Let me begin with 2 very clear procedural examples, in which *ἐδά* opens a metanarrative statement.

In the first example, the description of the last fight (ὁ ὑστερινὸς πόλεμος) which took place in Troy is closed off and the poet now informs us that he will proceed to its final destruction (τὸ πλήρωμα, τὴν ἀνάλωσιν):

- (4) Τοῦτος ἦτον ὁ ὑστερινὸς # πόλεμος ὅπου ἐγίνη.<sup>133</sup>  
Ἐδὰ νὰ εἰπῶ, νὰ ἀκούσετε # τὸ πλήρωμα πῶς ἦτον,<sup>134</sup>  
καὶ τῆς Τροίας τὴν ἀνάλωσιν # πῶς ἦτον, πῶς ἐγίνη (BT 11117-11119)

In his description of the consequences of Hektor's death, the poet suddenly brings in Darios: "let's see what Darios would tell about the lamentations":

- (5) Θρήνος τῶν Τρώων διὰ τὸν Ἑκτορα (7139t)  
Ἐδὰ τὸν θρήνον ἃς ὑπάη # ὁ Δάριος νὰ λέγῃ<sup>135</sup>  
τὸν ἔποικαν οἱ βασιλεῖς # οἱ ἔσωθεν Τρωάδος (BT 7139-7140)

The adverb under investigation also occurs in direct speech of personages (character text): in the next example, ἐδὰ marks Priam's transition from giving advice to his archonts (cf. twice ἄς) to asking for their opinion (cf. imperative εἴπετε):

- (6) Ἄς ποίσωμεν νὰ ὑγιάνουσι, # καὶ πάλι ἄς πολεμοῦμεν.  
Ἐδὰ εἴπετε πᾶσα εἷς # ἐξ ὅ, τι σᾶς ἀρέσει. (BT 5482-5483)

The following passage is somewhat similar: Hekabe asks her son Paris for a response (ἀπόκρισιν), after she has complained about her impending death (τὸν θάνατόν μου). Note the co-occurrence with λοιπόν:

- (7) «Υἱέ μου», λέγει, «κάλλιστε, # βλέπεις τὸν θάνατόν μου»  
ποτέ μου παρηγόρημα # οὐκ ἠμπορῶ νὰ ἔχω,  
ἕως ὅτου εἰς τὸν θάνατον # νὰ θέλω καταλάβει.  
Λοιπόν, ἂν θέλῃς τίποτε # μικρὸν νὰ ἐξανασάνω  
ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατέρας σου, # ποίσει μας θέλεις τοῦτο  
ὅπου σὲ θέλω τώρα εἰπεῖ, # ἐδὰ πληροφορήσου•  
ποτέ μου μὲ τὰ ὀμμάτια μου # οὐ μὴ νὰ σὲ τηρήσω...  
Ἐδὰ λοιπὸν ἀπόκρισιν # σκόπησε νὰ μοῦ δώσης».  
Ὁ Πάρις ἀπεκρίθηκε: «Κυρά μου, τί ἔναι τοῦτο; (BT 9853-9861)

---

<sup>133</sup> Note that this verse involves a strong enjambment (a prenominal adjective and its noun are separated by the caesura).

<sup>134</sup> Note the editorial right indentation.

<sup>135</sup> Note the editorial right indentation.

It might be of interest to note that the temporal adverb νῦν, which can be considered the Ancient Greek equivalent of ἐδᾶ (“now”), can still be found in all the texts of my corpus (except in the *Ilias Byzantina*). While νῦν is said to have developed procedural meanings in Ancient Greek (Conti 2012b; cf. supra 5.3.2.2.1), in my corpus, its use is predominantly conceptual. As a matter of fact, of the 108 instances νῦν occurs, it is in 93 cases preceded by the genitive neuter article or by a preposition (almost always ἀπέ/ό) and thus has genuine temporal value. Consider, for instance, the following verse, in which νῦν clearly refers to a concrete moment, namely the crowning of Achilles by his father. Achilles now takes over his governmental responsibilities, so that his parents can *from now on* live in peace:

- (8) Τοῦτο ποθῶ καὶ ὀρέγομαι # καὶ χάριταν σε δίδω,  
 ὅτι νᾶ ζῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν # ἐν πάσῃ ἐλευθερίᾳ,  
 ποσῶς μὴ ἔχῃς ὄχλησιν # ἢ ταραχὴν πολέμου,  
 ἀλλὰ τρυφὴν καὶ ἀνάπαυσιν # μετὰ καὶ τῆς μητρός μου (AB 183-186)

In the following verse, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν is specified by ὥρα μεσονυκτίου:

- (9) Ἦν δὲ καιρὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν # ὥρα μεσονυκτίου (AB 1145)

In our final example, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν is used as a synonym of ἀπὸ τῶρα:

- (10) Ἐγείρεστε ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, # μὴ θλίβεσθε ἀπὸ τῶρα (LR 2730)

I would also like to say a word about the adverb ἐδάρτε, which is in origin a merger of ἐδᾶ and the temporal adverb ἄρτι (“now”). This adverb is restricted to the *War of Troy* and the *Chronicle of Morea*, so it occurs only 24 times in my corpus. In 19 instances, it appears IU-initial. Although numbers are too small to draw firm conclusions, it seems to me that ἐδάρτε too has developed the capacity to function on the procedural level. Apparently, Egea (1993: 115f.) holds the same opinion, as ἐδάρτε is mentioned on his list (cf. supra 5.3.2.1). As is the case for ἐδᾶ, Kriaras gives λοιπόν as a Modern Greek equivalent; consider the third point of the lemma: “3) Λοιπόν: Εδάρτε, μάθε γράμματα καὶ θάρρει νᾶ προκόψεις (Γλυκά, Στ. 204)”. Note that this example involves imperatives. Just like λοιπόν, the adverb under investigation tends to occur in a so-called hortative environment (7 of the 19 P1 examples) (cf. supra 5.3.3.1.1).

This can clearly be seen in the next example, in which Agamemnon is encouraging the Greek army to destroy Troy. After boasting a bit on the invincibility of the Greeks, Agamemnon concludes his speech by referring back to the message that he wants to send to the Trojans (in order to get the revenge processed). Ἐδάρτε thus clearly signals a topic resumption; note the literal reiteration of μαντᾶτον and the semantic recurrence of γοργόν/ἐγλήγορα:

- (11) Τίποτε μὴ ἀναμείνωμεν, # ἀλλὰ γοργὸν μαντᾶτον  
 ἄς φθάσῃ πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλληνας # νὰ τοὺς παρακαλέσῃ,  
 ὅλοι εἰς τὴν ἐκδίκησιν # νὰ ἔλθοῦν τὴν ἐδικήν μας.  
 Μετὰ χαρᾶς, ἐγνώριζε, # ὅλοι νὰ καταλάβουν.  
 Καὶ ἡνίκα ὅλοι συναχθοῦν, # νὰ σμίξωμεν ἀντάμα,  
 ἐλπίζω κάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ # τινὰς νὰ μὴδὲν ἔνι  
 νὰ δυνηθῇ νὰ ἀντισταθῇ # καὶ νὰ μᾶς ἀντιτείνῃ,  
 πόλις νὰ μὴ ἔνι πούπετε # τόσα ἰσχυρὰ εἰς τὸν κόσμον  
 ὅπου νὰ μὴν τὴν ρίζωμεν # μέχρι τῶν θεμελίων.  
 Ἐδάρτε ἄς ὑπαγαίνωσιν # ἐγλήγορα μαντᾶτα,  
 διὰ νὰ περισυνάγωνται, # ποσὼς νὰ μὴν ἀργοῦμεν. (BT 2003-2013)

The following passage involves a metanarrative statement: now that Agamemnon's assignment as the new commander-in-chief (αὐθέντην, τὴν δεσποτείαν) after Palamedes' death has been described, we return to the war activities, namely to the 13th battle (τὸν τρισκαιδέκατον πόλεμον):

- (12) οὕτως καὶ τὸν ἐποίκασιν # αὐθέντην τοὺς οἱ πάντες•  
 ὅλην τοῦ τὴν ἐδώκασιν, # πᾶσαν τὴν δεσποτείαν.  
 Ἐδάρτε καὶ νὰ ἀκούσετε # τί ἐγίνη πάλε ὑστέρου<sup>136</sup>  
 ἀπὸ τὸν τρισκαιδέκατον # πόλεμον πῶς ἐγίνη (BT 8478-8481)<sup>137</sup>

However, ἐδάρτε can still exert its full temporal value, just like ἐδά. Take, for instance, the following 2 examples, in which ἐδάρτε occurs – not coincidentally – *inside* the IU (instead of at P1).

In the first example, the augur Kalchas is addressing his daughter Briseïs, whom he has just taken with him to the Greeks, out of Troy (ἐκεῖθεν). He tells her that she is now his only joy of life: “because I have taken you away *now*, I *no longer* need something else, such as wealth or glory”. Ἐδάρτε only has scope over the verb ἐβγάλω (which is repeated), as a genuine temporal adverb. Besides, the fact that the OCP σε stands in *preverbal* position presents further evidence in favour of a conceptual, i.e. temporal, interpretation of ἐδάρτε (which is thus focalised; cf. supra 5.3.2.1; cf. infra BT 7233):

- (13) Πάντα ἐφοβούμουν, ἔτρεμα, # μέγαν σκοπὸν ἐσκόπουν  
 τὸ πῶς καὶ μὲ τί πονηρίαν # ἐκεῖθεν νὰ σὲ ἐβγάλω•  
 ἀφὸν ἐδάρτε σὲ ἐβγάλα, # τίποτε ἄλλον οὐ χρήζω,

<sup>136</sup> Note the editorial right indentation.

<sup>137</sup> In parenthesis, note another strong enjambment over the caesura, which separates the prenominal adjective from its noun. However, manuscript A leaves πόλεμον out (Papathomopoulos & E. Jeffreys 1996: 446).



πλουῦτον ἢ δόξαν τίποτε # ἀφὸν ἐσέναν ἔχω. (BT 5933-5936)

In the next example, the verb (ἰδῶ) is also repeated by means of a synonym (βλέπω). Lurier (1964: 192) translates the verse as follows: “how desirous I have been to see you, just as I see you now”. Indeed, ἐδάρτε has a clear temporal sense: the longing of the sevastokrator to see to the lord of Karytaina is at the moment of speaking finally satisfied, for the lord now sits beside him:

(14) γλυκέα τὸν ἐχαιρέτησε, # σιμά του τὸν καθίζει•

“Καλῶς ἦλθες, ἀδελφι μου, # καλῶς ἦλθες γαμπρέ μου,

πολλὰ ἐπεθύμουν νὰ σὲ ἰδῶ # ὥσάν σὲ βλέπω ἐδάρτε.” (CoM H 4100-4102)

### 5.3.3.1.4 Ἐνταῦθα

#### General information

The adverb ἐνταῦθα/ἐνταῦτα<sup>138</sup>, which does not occur in the *Achilleis Byzantina*, *Ilias Byzantina*, *Imberios & Margarona* and *Phlorios & Platzia Phlora*, is not included in Egea’s (1993: 115f.) extensive list. The form is also not recorded in the dictionary of Kriaras. Our only hint at a potential DM-like use is given by Denniston (1954<sup>2</sup>: 236f.). When discussing the development of the particle δὴ into a full-blown connective, Denniston (1954<sup>2</sup>: 236f.; my italics) writes the following:

“The evolution is helped by the commonness of such openings to sentences as οὕτω δὴ, ἐνταῦθα δὴ. Here *the demonstrative adverb is in itself a sufficient link*, as is shown, for example, by Xenophon’s free use of ἔνθα, ἐνταῦθα, and so on, *at the beginning of the sentence without a connecting particle*”

Moreover, Jiménez Delgado (2013), who emphasises the non-temporal use of certain temporal adverbs in Ancient Greek, also mentions ἐνταῦθα (cf. “conectores con valor consecutivo”; cf. supra 5.3.2.2.1). Although lacking firmer indications, I am convinced that ἐνταῦθα can function on the procedural level in my corpus.

#### Semantics & syntax

The interpretation of ἐνταῦθα in terms of a DM is – once more – especially plausible when the adverb occupies P1, as Denniston seems to suggest in the above statement. As a matter of fact, of the 205 examples of ἐνταῦθα in my corpus, 160 open the IU. In the 45

<sup>138</sup> The spelling with τ instead of θ is limited to the *Chronicle of Morea*.

instances in which ἐνταῦθα occurs *inside* the IU, it usually exerts its conceptual meaning, which is more often spatial (“here, there”) than temporal (“at the very time, then”). In the next example, for instance, the spatial meaning of ἐνταῦτα is specified by ἐκεῖσε γὰρ εἰς τὸν Μορέαν (in which γὰρ again seems active on the phrasal rather the clausal/sentential level; cf. supra 5.3.1.2.2):

- (1) κράζει καὶ λέγει του· “Ἀδελφέ, # θέλω νὰ ὑπάρῃς ἐνταῦτα  
ἐκεῖσε γὰρ εἰς τὸν Μορέαν, # πᾶρε χιλίους μετ’ ἔσου (CoM H 4631-4632)

Beside a correlation between non-initial position and conceptual value, we can also detect a tendency of non-initial ἐνταῦθα to accompany a certain type of verbs, namely verbs which are – unsurprisingly – compatible with a spatial description. Μένω (“to stay”) is such a verb, for instance:

- (2) ἄς τὴν κρατήσωμεν διὰ ἐμᾶς # κι ἄς μείνωμεν ἐνταῦτα (CoM H 918)  
(3) Ὅσοι δὲ πάλιν θέλουσι # νὰ μείνουσιν ἐνταῦθα (BT 13005)

Εἶμαι (“to be”) constitutes another example:

- (4) Ἄς τὸ διακρίνῃ, ἀφέντη μου, # τῆς βασιλείας τὸ κράτος,  
πρὸς τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ καθενὸς # ὅπου εἴμεθεν ἐνταῦτα  
νὰ δώσῃ <νὰ> ἐξαγοραστῇ, # νὰ ἔβγῃ ἐκ τὴν φυλακὴν σου. (CoM H 4294-4296)

Εὐρίσκομαι can have the same meaning:

- (5) Ὅριζι, διαφεντεύει μας # ὅτι αὐριον τέτοιαν ὥραν  
νὰ μηδὲ εἷς ἀπὸ ἐμᾶς # εὐρίσκεται ἐνταῦθα. (BT 181-182)

However, the most frequently used verb is ἔρχομαι (“to go”):

- (6) ἄρξετον νὰ τὸν ἐρωτᾷ # τὸ πότε ἦλθεν ἐνταῦτα. (CoM H 5789)  
(7) ἐπεξενώθης καὶ ἔφυγες, # ἐλήλυθας ἐνταῦθα (VC 499)  
(8) Ὁ Κλιτοβῶν καταρωτᾷ # νὰ τὸν ὁμολογήσῃ  
τὸ πόθεν ἢ πατρίδα της # καὶ πῶς ἦλθεν ἐνταῦθα (LR 2900-2901)

The verb κάθημαι (“to sit”) makes up our final conceptual example, in which ἐνταῦθα refers to Troy, where the Greeks will be stuck for another 5 years:

- (9) Πλέον τῶν πέντε γὰρ ἐτῶν # καθήμεθα ἐνταῦθα (BT 7940)

If occurring in IU-initial position (160 of the 205 examples), though, ἐνταῦθα is normally immediately followed by a verb which does *not* allow such a spatial reading. More concretely, the P1 instances of ἐνταῦθα tend to precede so-called reporting verbs. Especially verbs of answering are popular candidates (16 of the 160 P1 examples):

(10) ἔδῳ ἔχεις τὰ φουσσᾶτα μας # κι ὡς θέλεις, διόρθωσέ τα.”

Ἐνταῦτα τοῦ ἀπεκρίθηκεν # ὁ πρίγκιπα Γυλιάμος•

“Ἀφέντη, ἀφῶν ὀρέγεσαι # κι ὀρίζεις νὰ τὸ ποιήσω (CoM H 6956-6958)

### Pragmatics

In the above instance, a conceptual spatial value of ἐνταῦθα is out of the question: “he answered here/there” does not make any sense. While one could of course claim that ἐνταῦθα then conveys its conceptual *temporal* meaning in the above example rather than its spatial one (“he answered then” does make sense), I think that something else – or maybe better: something more – is happening here: ἐνταῦθα is signalling a new step in the discourse. Indeed, we are again dealing with a discourse topic switch marker. However, I do believe that this procedural meaning of ἐνταῦθα is derived from its temporal meaning (rather than from its spatial one), as is the case with most adverbial DMs included in this section. As a result, it is often difficult to draw a very sharp line between the two uses, i.e. its use as a “pure” DM and its use as a genuine temporal adverb. I will now give cite some passages which might illustrate ἐνταῦθα’s use as a discourse topic switch marker.

In the next verses, sir Geoffrey proposes Robert to stay with him in the land of Morea, which is the rightful possession of the former according to the recent verdict, but Robert refuses, grieving (θλίψεως) because of the decision of the court. Then (ἐνταῦτα), we change topic: we learn about the invitation (κάλεσμα) to the party which the happy Geoffrey sent to all his acquaintances, so we switch, as it were, from the grief of Robert to the joy of Geoffrey:

(11) Κ’ ἐκεῖνος ἀπὸ θλίψεως του # οὐδὲν τὸ ἐκαταδέχτη.

Ἐνταῦτα ὁ μισὶρ Ντζεφρὲς # κάλεσμα μέγα ἐποίηκεν,<sup>139</sup>

κ’ ἐκάλεσεν τοὺς ἅπαντας, # μικροὺς τε καὶ μεγάλους (CoM H 2405-2407)<sup>140</sup>

<sup>139</sup> Note the editorial right indentation.

<sup>140</sup> The well-known formula μικροὶ τε καὶ μεγάλοι here takes the accusative; cf. supra 1.1.2.2.1.

The Frankish lord of Karytaina is fighting – and winning (cf. ἐζήμιωνεν μεγάλως) – against the Byzantines. Then (ἐνταῦτα), however, a misfortune (δυστυχίαν) befalls the Franks: the lord becomes ill and even dies, so here we switch from Frankish fortune to misfortune:

- (12) Ὁ ἀφέντης τῆς Καρύταινας # ἀνάπαψιν οὐκ εἶχεν  
 ἀπὸ ὅσοι ἐναπέμειναν # ἀπ' αὐτοῦς, νὰ ἦσαν ὕγιοι  
 τοῦ νὰ ἐβαστοῦσαν ἄρματα # καὶ νὰ ἐκαβαλλικεῦαν,  
 ἀεννάως τοὺς ἔπαιρνε μετ' αὐτὸν # κ' ὑπήγαιναν εἰς μάχην,  
 κ' ἐμάχησε μὲ τοὺς Ρωμαίους # κ' ἐζήμιωνεν μεγάλως.  
Ἐνταῦτα ἐσυνέβηκεν # ἀπὸ ἀμαρτίας τοῦ τόπου<sup>141</sup>  
 καὶ δυστυχίαν γὰρ τῶν Φραγκῶν # ἐτότε τοῦ Μορέως,  
 ἔπεσε εἰς ζάλην φοβερήν, # 'ς ἀστένειον βαρυτάτην  
 κ' ἐνίκησεν τὸ φυσικόν, # τὸ ἔχουσιν οἱ ἀνθρώποι,  
 κ' ἐπῆρε τὸν ὁ θάνατος # ἔδε ζημία μεγάλη  
 ὅπου ἦλθε ἐτότε εἰς τὸν Μορέαν, # θλίψη μεγάλη ἐγίνη. (CoM H 7208-7218)

Whereas one could still maintain that the above examples are on the very borderline between conceptual (temporal) and procedural meaning<sup>142</sup>, in the following examples an interpretation of ἐνταῦθα as presenting a simple temporal sequence (“then”) is definitely excluded, for we change from the narrative to the metanarrative level. I have selected 3 out of the 6 metanarrative examples. Note that all these examples are right indented in the edition:

- (13) ἐπλήρωσαν τὸν ὄρκον τοὺς # καὶ τὴν ὑπόσχεσίν τοὺς.  
Ἐνταῦτα ἄρξομαι ἀπ' ἐδῶ, # θέλω τοῦ νὰ σκολάσω  
 ἐτοῦτο ὅπου ἀφηγήσομαι, # ἄλλο νὰ καταπιάσω (CoM H 440-442)
- (14) ἐξέβη ἀπὸ τὴν Λουμπαρδίαν # καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν Πούλιαν.  
Ἐνταῦτα παύομαι ἀπ' ἐδῶ # νὰ γράφω καὶ νὰ λέγω  
 περὶ τοῦ Ἀλαμάνου ἐκείνου, # τοῦ ἐξάκουστου στρατιώτου (CoM H 6812-6814)
- (15) νὰ τὸ βλάψουν μὲ πόλεμον, # μόνι νὰ ἔχη σωτάρχειον.  
Ἐνταῦτα παύομαι ἐδῶ # περὶ τοῦ βασιλέως  
 καὶ θέλω νὰ σὰς ἀφηγηθῶ # τὴν πρᾶξιν τοῦ Δεσπότη. (CoM H 8802-8804)

<sup>141</sup> Note the editorial right indentation.

<sup>142</sup> Consider, for instance, the preverbal position of the OCP τοῦ in CoM H 6956-6958 above; it does not confirm a procedural interpretation, in which case we would have expected a postverbal OCP.

Of course, one could raise that ἐνταῦθα here conveys its conceptual spatial meaning (“here”) instead of its temporal one. However, the fact that a spatial expression (ἄπ’ ἐδῶ or ἐδῶ) is already present renders this interpretation rather unlikely, without being conclusive evidence, though (cf. ἐν τούτῳ infra 5.3.3.1.5).

There is another – admittedly rather weak – argument that my analysis of ἐνταῦθα as a DM is on the right track: while Lurier (1964) consistently translates the non-initial instances of ἐνταῦθα as “here”, he seems to have difficulties to grasp the precise meaning of IU-initial ἐνταῦθα. Accordingly, he presents various translations (“therefore”, “then”, “thereupon”, “thereafter”, “afterwards”, “hereafter”, “as a result”, “thereby” or simply untranslated). We have seen that semantic shallowness is one of the characteristics of DMs (cf. supra 2.5.1.5). Moreover, some of Lurier’s equivalents, such as “then”, are well-known DMs in the modern spoken English (e.g. Schiffrin 1987).

### 5.3.3.1.5 Ἐν τούτῳ

#### *General information*

The expression ἐν τούτῳ is limited to the *Chronicle of Morea*. Although ἐν τούτῳ is not on Egea’s (1993: 115f.) list of newly developed DMs in LMG, we can find a hint at its procedural use in his grammar of the *Chronicle of Morea*. More concretely, Egea (1988: 105) proposes “y así”, “entonces” and “pues bien” as appropriate translations and even compares ἐν τούτῳ with λοιπόν. Once more, a comparison is thus made between a potential DM candidate and the well-known λοιπόν (cf. Kriaras on ἐδά(ρτε) supra 5.3.3.1.3).

#### *Semantics & syntax*

To begin with, all 121 instances occupy P1.

#### *Pragmatics*

In most of these examples, ἐν τούτῳ has lost its demonstrative value: it is not possible to give the precise reference of τούτῳ – note that it is a fossilised expression, made up of the ancient dative (cf. Lendari & Manolessou 2003: 403; cf. supra 2.5.1.4). Once again, I cannot avoid the impression that the expression under investigation can be used to mark a switch in discourse topic.

In the following verses, for instance, the author proceeds from (the intention for) war with the Germans (ταραχὴν, μάχην) to “the affair” (ἡ ὑπόθεσις) (the king of France invites the English king; when the two queens sit together with the countess of Provence, the countess is regarded as not being of equal rank and bursts into tears):

- (1) ἤθελεν βάλει εἰς ταραχὴν # κ' εἰς μάχην γὰρ μεγάλην  
 μὲ τοὺς Ἀλλαμάνους ἀλλὰ δὴ # καὶ μὲ τοὺς Γημηλίνους.<sup>143</sup>  
 κ' ἤθελεν ἔχει ἀμαρτία # διὰ τὰ φονοκοπεῖα  
 τῆς μάχης καὶ τοῦ ἐξηλειμοῦ # 'ς τῶν Χριστιανῶν τὸ γένος.  
Ἐν τούτῳ ἐξῆλθε ἡ ὑπόθεσις, # ἐτοῦτο ὅπου σὲ γράφω.  
 Ὁ ρῆγας ἐκεῖνος τῆς Φραγκίας # ὠρέχτη νὰ ποιήσῃ (CoM H 6007-6012)

In the next example, ἐν τούτῳ occurs with the same phraseology as in the previous one, namely (ἐξ)ῆλθε ὑπόθεσις. Here, it introduces a completely different setting with new characters: from the crowning of Sir Geoffrey the younger (after the death of Sir Geoffrey the older) and the homages which he receives (τὴν δόξαν, τὴν τιμὴν), we move to the marriage alliance which Robert makes with the king of Aragon:

- (2) Καὶ ὅσον ἐπαράλαβεν # τῆς ἀφεντίας τὴν δόξαν,  
 ἄρξετον νὰ πορεύεται # ὡς φρόνιμος στρατιώτης  
 πολλὰ ἦτον προθυμότατος, # φιλάνθρωπος εἰς ὅλους,  
 εἰς σφόδρα γὰρ ἐσπούδαζεν # ν' αὐξαίνει τὴν τιμὴν του.  
Ἐν τούτῳ ῆλθε ὑπόθεσις, # ἀφκράζου νὰ σὲ λέγω,<sup>144</sup>  
 ὅτι ὁ Ρομπέρτος βασιλεὺς # τῆς Κωνσταντίνου πόλης,  
 ποῦ ἦτον τότε εἰς τὴν Ρωμανίαν # ἀφέντης βασιλέας,  
 συνθῆκες καὶ συμβίβασες, # τρόπον συμπεθερίας,  
 ἔποιε μὲ τὸν ροῖ Ραγκοῦ, # ρῆγαν τῆς Κατελώνιας,  
 νὰ ἐπάρῃ εἰς γυναῖκαν του # τοῦ βασιλέως θυγάτηρ·  
 εἰς κάτεργα δύο τὴν ἔθεκεν # μετὰ τιμῆς μεγάλης (CoM H 2468-2478)

While the 2 above examples can still be considered so-called borderline cases, this is not the case for the next examples, in which ἐν τούτῳ introduces a metanarrative statement. I have selected 2 representative examples out of the 20 metanarrative examples that the *Chronicle of Morea* contains:

- (3) φουσᾶτα ἐρρογέψαι # ὅσα ἠμποροῦσαν νὰ ἔχουν.  
Ἐν τούτῳ ἀφήνω, τὰ λαλῶ # κι ἄλλα νὰ καταπιάσω,<sup>145</sup>  
 νὰ σᾶς εἰπῶ κι ἀφηγηθῶ # περὶ τοῦ βασιλέως. (CoM H 3520-3522)
- (4) κι οὕτως ἐνέμεινεν αὐτὸς # μὲ ἀνάπαψιν κ' εἰρήνην  
 ρῆγας ἀφέντης Σικελίας # καὶ τοῦ ρηγάτου Πούλιας.

<sup>143</sup> The first half-verse is hypermetrical; in parallel manuscript P we read:  
 μετὰ τοὺς Ἀλλαμάνους τε # καὶ μὲ τοὺς Γγιπλίνους.

<sup>144</sup> Note the editorial right indentation.

<sup>145</sup> Note the editorial right indentation.

Ἐν τούτῳ ἀφίνω νὰ λαλῶ # αὐτό, τὸ σὲ ἀφηγοῦμαι,<sup>146</sup>  
καὶ θέλω πάλε νὰ στραφῶ # στὸν πρίγκιπα Γυλιάμον (CoM H 6239-6242)

Lurier again runs up against translating difficulties and renders ἐν τούτῳ in many different ways: “therefore”, “thereupon”, “then”, “now”, “in this matter”, “for this reason”, “as a result”, “in this connection”, “with this”. Again, many of these suggestions are well-known English DMs (cf. ἐνταῦθα supra 5.3.3.1.4; cf. ἀπ(’)αὐτοῦ infra 5.3.3.1.6). Apparently, Lurier tends to translate the metanarrative instances as “at this point”. As such, the 2 above examples sound as follows: “At this point, I turn from what I have been telling and I am going to take up other matters” (Lurier 1964: 176) and “At this point, I shall leave off speaking of what I was telling you about” (Lurier 1964: 250). This might give the impression that we could interpret ἐν τούτῳ as a spatial expression. This would mean that τούτῳ does have referential and thus conceptual value: it would then refer to a certain place (albeit not a literal one, yet one in the course of the discourse). However, the following examples in which a spatial expression is already present render this interpretation rather unlikely (cf. ἐνταῦθα supra 5.3.3.1.4).

In our first example, Lurier’s (1964: 237) translation sounds as follows: “At this point, I turn from what I have been telling you”. Confusingly, the Greek equivalent of “at this point” seems here not ἐν τούτῳ (as in the 2 above metanarrative examples), but the spatial adverb ἐδῶ (meaning “here”, “in this place” and thus also “at this point”). So it looks like that Lurier has actually left ἐν τούτῳ untranslated:

- (5) Ἔποικεν δύο καβαλλάριους, # ἔδωκέν τους προνοῖες,  
γυναῖκες γὰρ τοὺς ἔδωκεν, # κ’ ἐποίησιν παιδία,  
ὅπου εἶναι ἀκόμη εἰς τὸν Μορέαν, # στοῦ Βουνάρβη, στὴν Ρένταν.  
Ἐν τούτῳ ἀφίνομεν ἐδῶ # ἐτοῦτο, ὅπου ἀφηγοῦμαι,<sup>147</sup>  
καὶ θέλω νὰ σὲ ἀφηγηθῶ διὰ ἐκεῖνον τὸν στρατιώτην (CoM H 5736-5740)

With regard to the next example, Lurier (1964: 161) gives the following translation: “Now from this point on, I am going to stop speaking”. In my opinion, the phrase “from this point on” serves as the translation of the expression ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, while ἐν τούτῳ receives the English translation “now”:

- (6) καὶ περιεπάτει, ἐχαίρετον # ἀπὸ [ὅλον] τὸ πριγκιπᾶτο,  
ὥσάν τὸ ἐκατακύριεψεν # καὶ ἀφεντέψε το ὅλον.  
Ἐν τούτῳ θέλω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν # νὰ πάψω καὶ νὰ λέγω<sup>148</sup>

<sup>146</sup> Note the editorial right indentation.

<sup>147</sup> Note the editorial right indentation.

The following longer passage might perhaps be more clarifying: Lurier (1964: 102) translates the two relevant verses as: “Now, I stop at this point” and “Therefore, I shall begin at this point”. Thus, ἐν τούτῳ is rendered by “now” and “therefore” respectively, while ἀπ’ ἐδῶ twice receives the translation “at this point”:

- (7) Καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τὸ ἀκούσει το # μεγάλως τὸ ἐβαρύνθη.  
ὑστερον γὰρ ἰσιάστησαν, # καθὼς τὸ θέλεις μάθει  
ἐδῶ εἰς ἐτοῦτο τὸ βιβλίον # ἔμπροσθεν ᾗ ἄλλην λέξιν.  
Ἐν τούτῳ παύω ἀπ’ ἐδῶ, # θέλω τοῦ νὰ σκολάσω<sup>149</sup>  
ἐτοῦτο ὅπου ἀφηγήσομαι, # ἄλλο νὰ καταπιάσω,  
νὰ σᾶς εἰπῶ ἀφήγησιν, # καταλογὴν μεγάλην,  
τὸ πῶς ἐπράξαν οἱ Ρωμαῖοι, # ἀφότου ἐξεπέσαν  
κ’ ἐχάσαν τὴν βασιλείαν # τῆς Κωνσταντίνου πόλης.  
Ἐν τούτῳ ἄρξομαι ἀπ’ ἐδῶ, # ἀφκράζου νὰ μανθάνης.  
Τὸν χρόνον γὰρ καὶ τὸν καιρὸν # ὅπου ἔπιασαν οἱ Φράγκοι (CoM H 1196-1205)

Although translational evidence is rather weak evidence, it seems that Lurier supports our non-spatial interpretation of ἐν τούτῳ. Rather, he renders ἐν τούτῳ by “now” and “therefore”, which are again well-known English DMs.

Moreover, it is revealing that ἐνταῦθα appears in exactly the same construction as the last instance of ἐν τούτῳ in the above example (cf. supra 5.3.3.1.4):<sup>150</sup>

- (8) Ἐνταῦθα ἄρξομαι ἀπ’ ἐδῶ, # θέλω τοῦ νὰ σκολάσω (CoM H 441)

cf. Ἐν τούτῳ ἄρξομαι ἀπ’ ἐδῶ # κι ἀφκράζου τὰ σὲ λέγω (CoM H 1356)<sup>151</sup>

Interestingly, parallel manuscript P also contains the form ἐν τούτῳ:

Ἐν τούτῳ θέλω ἀπ’ ἐδῶ # ὅπως νὰ τὸ σκολάσω (CoM P 441)

---

<sup>148</sup> Note the editorial right indentation.

<sup>149</sup> Note the editorial right indentation.

<sup>150</sup> Lurier translates these two verses respectively as:

“Now, beginning at this point, I am going to turn” (Lurier 1964: 80)

“Therefore, I shall begin at this point, and listen to what I tell you” (Lurier 1964: 107)

In my view, “at this point” again serves as the translation of ἀπ’ ἐδῶ, while “now” and “therefore” are the English equivalents of ἐνταῦθα and ἐν τούτῳ.

<sup>151</sup> Note the editorial right indentation.



The fact that both ἐν τούτῳ and ἐνταῦθα are used in exactly the same (metanarrative) context and are even mutually exchangeable corroborates the idea that their conceptual meaning has to a large extent been bleached.

#### 5.3.3.1.6 Ἀπ(')αὐτοῦ

##### *General information*

Just like ἐδάρτε, the expression ἀπ(')αὐτοῦ is confined to the *War of Troy* and the *Chronicle of Morea* and just like ἐν τούτῳ, it is not found on Egea's (1993: 115f.) list.

##### *Semantics & syntax*

Tellingly, all but one of the 142 instances of ἀπ(')αὐτοῦ occur at P1.<sup>152</sup> However, ἀπ(')αὐτοῦ can still exert its original conceptual meaning. In the first place, this meaning can be a temporal one (“ὕστερα” in Kriaras). In the next example, Nestor speaks first (πρότερον) and afterwards (ἀπ' αὐτοῦ) it is Odysseus' turn:

- (1) Ὁ γέρων ὁ Νεστόριος # πρότερον συντυχαίνει  
τάχατε τὸ χαιρέτισμα, # καὶ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Ὀδυσσεύας  
τὸν Ἀχιλλεὺ ἐχείρησεν # οὕτως νὰ συντυχαίνῃ (BT 8583-8585)

Before the Trojans can wash Hektor's body, they have to disarm it. Again, the *preverbal* position of the OCP τόν confirms our conceptual interpretation (cf. supra 5.3.2.1):

- (2) Πρῶτον ἐξαρματώσαν τον, # ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸν ἐπλύναν (BT 7233)

The next example is the third one in which a form of πρῶτος clearly proves that ἀπ(')αὐτοῦ enters into a temporal sequence: first (πρῶτα), the person himself is disinherited, afterwards (ἀπαύτου) his descendants are. This temporal interpretation is confirmed by the parallel manuscript: ἀπαύτου in H corresponds with the temporal adverb ἔπειτα in P:

- (3) πρῶτα ἀκληρᾶται ὀλοστινὸς # κι ἀπαύτου ἡ γενεά του  
ἀπὸ ὅσον τόπον κι ἀφεντίαν # ἔχει καὶ ἀφεντεύει. (CoM H 8172-8173)

cf. πρῶτον νὰ ἀκληρᾶται αὐτός, # ἔπειτα ἡ γενεά του (CoM P 8173)

<sup>152</sup> The exception is BT 5987.

In the next example, the context makes clear that we are dealing with a temporal instance of ἀπ' αὐτοῦ: in the morning, the Trojan delegates ask the Greek leader Agamemnon for a truce of 30 days (τριάκοντα ἡμέρας); afterwards (ἀπ' αὐτοῦ), they can grant the corpses a decent funeral:

- (4) Τὴν πρωΐαν ἀπέστειλεν # ὁ Πρίαμος μαντᾶτον•  
 φρονίμους ἐξελέξατο, # καλοὺς καβαλλαρίους•  
 ἀγάπην ἐζητήσασιν # Ἀγαμέμνων νὰ ποίση,  
 καὶ τριάκοντα τὴν ἔστησαν # ἡμέρας ἀμφοτέρως.  
Ἀπ' αὐτοῦ θάπτουν τοὺς νεκροὺς # οἱ πάντες τοὺς ἰδίους. (BT 9827-9831)

Beside a temporal meaning, ἀπ(')αὐτοῦ also often exerts a spatial meaning (“ἀπό ἐκεῖ” in Kriaras). In the next example, for instance, we get a topography (cf. ἐδῶ, σιμά, ποῦ ἔνι ἀπάνω στὸν αἰγιαλόν, ἐκεῖ, ἀπέκει), so ἀπαύτου definitely has spatial value:

- (5) ἐδῶ σιμά [μας] εὐρίσκεται # τοῦ Πονδικοῦ τὸ κάστρον,  
 ποῦ ἔνι ἀπάνω στὸν αἰγιαλόν, # ἐκεῖ ἃς ἀπελθοῦμεν,  
ἀπαύτου ἔνι ἡ Ἀρκαδία # καὶ ἀπέκει ἡ Κορώνη,  
 κι ὁκάτι ὀλίγον πρὸς ἐκεῖ # ἔνι ἡ Καλαμάτα. (CoM H 1661-1664)

The following verses too abounds with spatial indications (στὴν Ἰσοβαν, εἰς τὴν Πρινίτσαν, ἐκεῖ):

- (6) στὴν Ἰσοβαν ἐδιάβηκεν # ἀλλάγι ἀπὸ τοὺς Τούρκους,  
 τὸ μοναστήρι ἐκάψασιν, # ἔδε ἀμαρτία ποῦ ἐγίνη.  
Ἀπαύτου ἐκατέβησαν # ὁλόρθα εἰς τὴν Πρινίτσαν•  
 ἐκεῖ κατοῦνες ἔπιασαν, # ἐστήσασιν τὲς τέντες. (CoM H 4671-4674)

### Pragmatics

Nonetheless, in some instances, an interpretation in conceptual terms can be excluded – or is at least highly unlikely. Once again, an analysis of ἀπ(')αὐτοῦ as a procedural means to signal a discourse topic switch is much more plausible.

In the next example, for instance, the Trojans are on the winning side and compel the Greeks back to their ships. By means of ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, we zoom in on two warriors (Archelaos and Prothenor), who occupy the harbour:

- (7) Ἐτρόπευσαν, ἠφέραν τοὺς # ἀπέσω τῆς θαλάσσης•  
 οἱ πλεώτεροι ἐφονεύθησαν # ἀπάνωθεν τῆς γίγγλας.  
 Τὰ κάστρη ὅπου ἐστήκασιν # ἀπάνω τῶν κατέργων,  
 ἐκεῖνα ἐδιαφέντευαν # τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἀπ' αὐτοὺς.  
 Ἐπὶ χιλιάδες Ἕλληνες # εἰς ἑκατὸν χιλιάδες,  
 τί εἶχαν κάμει μοναχοί; # πολὺ ἦτον τὸ ἐποῖκαν,  
 καὶ πῶς τοὺς ὑπομένουσι, # καὶ πῶς τοὺς ἀντιστέκουν.

Ἄπ' αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἀρχέλαος # καὶ Προθενὼρ ἐφθάσαν.<sup>153</sup>  
στανέο τῶν ἀντιδίκων τους # ἐπιάσασι τὸ πόρτον (BT 3010-3018)

There is a significant break (ἄπ' αὐτοῦ) between the ἔκφρασις of the temple of Apollo (the throne, τὸ θρονίον, being the last aspect in the description) to the lament (ὁ θρῆνος) over the dead Hektor, who will be buried in it:

(8) ὁ ναὸς τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος # ἦν οἰκοδομημένος, (BT 7290)  
(...)

Καὶ τὸ θρονίον τὸ φοβερόν, # τίς νὰ τὸ ἐξετιμήσῃ;<sup>154</sup>  
Τοῦτο δι' ἀλήθειαν λέγω σας, # ὡς ἱστορία λέγει,  
οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς Σπάνιας # καὶ τῆς Ἀλαμανίας  
μὲ ὅλην τους τὴν δύναμιν # τέτοιον οὐ μὴ τὸ ἐποίησαν.

Ἄπ' αὐτοῦ ἐπῆραν τὸ κορμὶν # τοῦ θανυμαστοῦ Ἐκτόρου,<sup>155</sup>  
ἐκ τὸ παλάτιν τὸ χρυσόν, # ἔξω νὰ τὸ ἐβγάλουν  
τῆς πόλεως τῆς περίφουμης, # ἐκείνης τῆς Τρωάδος.  
Τότε καὶ πάλιν ἄρχισεν # ὁ θρῆνος ὑπὲρ μέτρου,  
ἄνδρες, γυναῖκες νὰ θρηνοῦν # καὶ μείρακες, παιδίσκαι (BT 7297-7305)

In the next verses as well, ἄπ' αὐτοῦ marks a new step in the discourse: from an outline of the Greeks' plan to deceive Priam (they will pretend that they have sailed away, but the ships are actually lying a bit further down, in a bay), we proceed to their actions, i.e. the actual burning (of some) of their tents (ἄναψαν, πυρπολοῦσιν):

(9) Οἱ Ἕλληνες ἐποίκασι # Πρίαμον νὰ πιστεύσῃ  
ὅτι ὅλα τὰ φουσσᾶτα τους # μετὰ καὶ τῶν κατέργων  
εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦ Σιγρόν, # εἰς τοῦτον τὸν λιμένα,  
ἐκεῖ νὰ στείλουν ἅπαντας, # καὶ τότε νὰ ἀποστείλουν (12091-12094)  
(...)

Οὕτως αὐτοὶ τὸν Πρίαμον # ἐπλάνεσαν ἐτότε.  
Στέργει το τοῦτο Πρίαμος, # οὕτως εἶπε νὰ γένη.<sup>156</sup>  
Ἄπ' αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν στράταν τους # ἐβάλθησαν, ὑπάγουν,<sup>157</sup>  
καὶ τὰς κατοῦνας ἄναψαν, # ὅλας τὰς πυρπολοῦσιν,<sup>158</sup>  
ὅπου τὰς εἶχαν, ἤξευρε, # ὅλας καλὰς, ὠραίας (BT 12100-12104)

<sup>153</sup> Note the editorial right indentation.

<sup>154</sup> This verse presents an instance of topic left-dislocation; cf. supra 5.2.3.2.2.

<sup>155</sup> Note the editorial right indentation.

<sup>156</sup> This verse presents an instance of backgrounding; cf. supra 5.2.3.2.3.

<sup>157</sup> Note the editorial right indentation.

<sup>158</sup> This verse presents an instance of topicalisation; cf. supra 5.2.3.2.1.

Odysseus is telling the account of his adventures, more precisely: what he and his companions endured the month they were held captive in Zilikos. First, it is about the two brother kings (Lestrigonon and Thiglopon), who stole their resources; he then switches (ἀπ' αὐτοῦ) to their cruel sons (Amfimachos and Poliphimos), who even killed more than hundred of his companions. In the section on πάλιν (cf. infra 5.3.3.2), it will become clear that this example is actually on the borderline between signalling a *discourse* and a *sentence* topic switch:

- (10) Εἰς τὴν Ζήλικον ἦλθαμεν, # κακὰ μᾶς ἀππλικεῦσε  
 τὸ μελλόμενον, ἤξευρε, # τῆς ἀσυστάτου Τύχης.  
 Ὅ τόπος εἶχε βασιλεῖς # δύο σκληροῦς, ἐχθίστους,  
 Λεστρίγονον καὶ Θίγλωπον, # ὁμαίμονες οἱ δύο.  
 Ὡς εἶδαν τὸ λογάριν μου # τὸ τόσον, τὸ μέγαλον,  
 ἦλθαν, ἀπῆραν, ἔκαμαν # ὅσον ἠθέλαν τοῦτο•  
 τινὰς οὐδὲν ἐδύνετον # διὰ νὰ τοὺς ἀντιτείνῃ.  
 Ἄφες πάλιν τὴν ἐντροπὴν # τὴν τόσῃν ἦν μᾶς ποῖκαν.  
 Ἀπ' αὐτοῦ πάλιν οἱ υἱοὶ # τούτων τῶν βασιλέων,  
 ἐκλεκτοὶ εἰς τὰ ἄρματα, # φρικτοὶ εἰς τὴν ἀνδρείαν,  
 Ἀμφίμαχος, Πολύφημος # ἐλέγονταν οἱ δύο,  
 ἑκατὸν καὶ πλεώτερον # συντρόφους μοῦ ἐσκοτῶσαν,  
 τοὺς ἄλλους ἐπιάσασιν, # εἰς φυλακὴν ἐβάλαν.  
 Τὸ πρᾶγμα μᾶς ἐπήρασιν, # ἐκούρσευσαν τελείως.  
 Μῆναν ἓναν ἐποίκαμεν # εἰς τὴν ἄλυσον ὅλοι. (BT 13625-13639)

Our poet enumerates the men who remain with Prince Guillaume in Elis (cf. repetition of the verbal form ἐνέμεινε/αν). He makes use of ἀπαύτου to structure his list: the first (ὁ πρῶτος) is Sir Ancelin; the second (ἀπαύτου) Sir Vilain d'Aunoy, and so on. Attributing a temporal/spatial meaning (“after him”) to ἀπαύτου does not make much sense: it is not as if these men arrive in Elis day after day or that they literally stand behind each other:<sup>159</sup>

- (11) Ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ ἐνέμειναν # ὅπου τοὺς ὀνομάζω.  
 Ὁ πρῶτος ὁ μισὶρ Ἀσελής, # ντὲ Ντουῖθ εἶχεν τὸ ἐπὶ κλινῇ,  
 αὐτάδελφος ἦτον τοῦ Καίσαρη # ἐτότε τῆς Πολέου,  
 τὴν μήτηρ τοῦ μισὶρ Ντζεφρὲ # ἐκείνου ντὲ Ντουρνάη  
 ἐπῆρεν εἰς γυναῖκαν τοῦ # κ' ἐνέμεινε εἰς τὸν τόπον.  
 Ἀπαύτου ἦτο ὁ μισὶρ Βηλές, # ντὲ Ἀνόε εἶχεν τὸ ἐπὶ κλινῇ,  
 ὅπου ἦτον πρωτοστράτορας # τῆς Ρωμανίας ἐτότε•

<sup>159</sup> Blomqvist (1969: 22) considers particles which “introduce the second, third, etc. item in a series” *progressive* particles.

Ἐνέμειναν οἱ ντὲ Μπλαθοὶ # κ' ἐκεῖνοι οἱ ντὲ Βερήθοι.  
 Ντὲ Ἀμπή ἦσαν τέσσαροι ἀδελφοί, # ντὲ Ἀνὴ ἦσαν ἄλλοι δύο.  
 Ἄλλος ἦτον ντὲ Λεσπηγγὰς # καὶ πλεῖστοι ἄλλοι σιργέντες  
 ὁμοίως καὶ ἄρχοντες Ρωμαῖοι # ἐνέμειναν κ' ἐκεῖνοι,  
 τοὺς ὁποίους οὐκ ὀνομάζω σε # διὰ τὴν πολυγραφίαν. (CoM H 1320-1332)

In our final passage, we also see ἐν τούτῳ again at work: we begin with a metanarrative statement opened by ἐν τούτῳ. In this metanarrative statement the poet explicitly signals that he will change his subject matter: he stops speaking about the despot of Arta and will continue with Sir Guillaume. After the latter's capture of the castle of Monemvasia, his dominions are extended and all his knights bannerets begin to raise castles, each in their own territory. A recital of these knights follows: the first (Sir Geoffrey) is introduced by ἐν τούτῳ, while ἀπαύτου (untranslated by Lurier) signals the switch to the second one (Sir Gautier). After having called two others by name (Sir Jean & de Nivelet), the author evidently has had enough of it and simply utters the phrase "and so did the rest" (ὡσαύτως καὶ οἱ ἕτεροι). The switch to another discourse topic (the war, ἡ μάχη, between the Prince of Morea and the lord of Athens) is again indicated by a metanarrative statement introduced by ἐν τούτῳ:

(12) Ἐν τούτῳ θέλω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν # νὰ πάψω ἐδῶ ὀλίγον,<sup>160</sup>  
 νὰ συντυχαίνω καὶ λαλῶ # ἐκ τὸν Δεσπότην Ἄρτας,  
 καὶ θέλω νὰ σᾶς ἔχω εἰπεῖ # καὶ νὰ σᾶς ἀφηγήσω  
 περὶ τοῦ πρίγκιπος Μορέως, # ἐκεῖνου τοῦ Γυλιάμου.  
 Ἀφότου γὰρ ἐκέρδισεν # ὁ πρίγκιπας Γυλιάμος  
 τὸ κάστρον τῆς Μονοβασίας, # ἐπλάτυνε ἡ ἀφεντία του·  
 οὐκ εἶχεν γὰρ νὰ μάχεται # μὲ ἄνθρωπον τοῦ κόσμου.  
 Οἱ φλαμουριάροι τοῦ Μορέως # ὁμοίως κ' οἱ καβαλλάροι  
 ἀρχάσασιν νὰ πολεμοῦν # κάστρη καὶ δυναμάρια,  
 ὁ κατὰ εἷς στὸν τόπον του # νὰ κάμνη τὸ ἐδικόν του·  
 κι ὡσὰν τὰ ἐκατασταίνασι # τὰ δυναμάρια ἐκεῖνα,  
 ἀφῆναν τὰ ὑπονόμια τους, # τὰ εἶχαν ἐκ τὴν Φραγκίαν,  
 κ' ἐπαίρνασιν τοῦ τόπου τους # τ' ὄνομα ὅπου ἐβάναν.  
Ἐν τούτῳ ἄρχισεν ὁμπρὸς # ὁκάποιος [μέγας] ἀφέντης<sup>161</sup>  
 μισὶρ Ντζεφρὲ τὸν ἔλεγαν, # τὸ ἐπὶ κλην του ντὲ Μπριέρες,  
 ὅπου ἦτο ἀφέντης τῶν Σκορτῶν, # τοῦ δρόγγου καὶ τοῦ τόπου·

<sup>160</sup> Lurier's (1964: 165) translation sounds as follows: "At this point, I am going to pause". As such, he again seems to leave ἐν τούτῳ untranslated, for "at this point" presumably corresponds to the expression ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν; cf. ἐν τούτῳ supra 5.3.3.1.5.

<sup>161</sup> Note the editorial right indentation.

κάστρον ἐποίησε ἀφιρόν, # ὁμορφον δυναμάριν,  
 Καρύταινα τὸ ὠνόμασεν κ' ἐκεῖνος ὠνομάστην  
 ἀφέντης τῆς Καρύταινας, # ὁ ἐξάκουστος στρατιώτης.  
 Ἀπαύτου γὰρ ὁ δεύτερος, # μισὶρ Γαρτιέρης ἄκουε,  
 ντὲ Ροζιέρες τὸν ἔλεγαν, # οὕτως εἶχεν τὸ ἐπὶ κλην  
 κάστρον ἐποίησε φοβερὸν # ἐκεῖ εἰς τὴν Μεσαρέαν  
 καὶ Ἀκωβαν τὸ ὠνόμασεν, # κ' ἐκεῖνος ἦτο ἀφέντης. (CoM H 3138-3160)  
 (...)

Ὡσαύτως καὶ οἱ ἕτεροι # ὅπου εἶχαν ἀφεντίες,  
 οἱ καβαλλάροι κι ἀρχιερεῖς # κι ὅλοι οἱ φλαμουριάροι,  
 ὁ κατὰ εἷς στὸν τόπον του # ἐποίησεν δυναμάριν  
 τοῦ κόσμου γὰρ τὴν ἡδονὴν # ἠθέλαν κι ἀγαποῦσαν,  
 κ' ἐχαίρονταν ἀμφότεροι # πρὸς τὸν καιρὸν ὅπου εἶχαν.

Ἐν τούτῳ θέλω πάψει ἐδῶ # νὰ λέγω ἀπ' ἐκείνους<sup>162</sup>  
 καὶ στρέφομαι νὰ σᾶς εἰπῶ # τὸ πῶς ἄρχασε ἡ μάχη  
 ἀπὸ τὸν πρίγκιπα Μορέως, # ἐκεῖνον τὸν Γυλιάμον,  
 μὲ τὸν ἀφέντην Ἀθηνῶν, # μισὶρ Γυλιάμον ἄκω (CoM H 3168-3176)

With regard to ἀπαύτου as well, Lurier (1964) does not seem to know what to do with it and again proposes many different translations: “next”, “then”, “thus”, “finally”, “after him/this”, “afterwards”, “from there”, “in addition” (cf. supra ἐνταῦθα 5.3.3.1.4 & ἐν τούτῳ 5.3.3.1.5).

Finally, it is noteworthy that in the *Chronicle of Morea* the expression under scrutiny is written and thus perceived as a fossilised word-like unit, i.e. ἀπαύτου (instead of ἀπ' αὐτοῦ/αὐτοῦ), which testifies to its grammaticalised character and thus to its status as a DM (cf. supra 2.5.1.4).<sup>163</sup>

<sup>162</sup> Lurier (1964: 166) translates this verse as: “At this point, I am going to stop speaking about them”. Once more, Lurier seems to leave ἐν τούτῳ untranslated, for “at this point” presumably corresponds to the expression ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν; cf. supra 5.3.3.1.5.

<sup>163</sup> The parallel P manuscript also contains the form ἀπαῦτο. Note that the accent has changed position in relation to its original form: ἀπαύτου instead of ἀπαντοῦ/τού. Kriaras treats both forms as variants; with respect to the non-composite spatial/temporal adverb αὐτοῦ, αὐτοῦ is also given as a variant (the accentual variation between αὐτός and αὐτός being rather widespread). We can draw a tentative parallel with the grammaticalisation of the coordinating conjunction ἀλλά (“but”): this word originally derives from the conceptual ἄλλος (“other”), yet when it is used adverbially the position of the accent changes (Smyth 2002<sup>12</sup>: 632; Schwyzer 1950: 387).

### 5.3.3.2 P2 adverb πάλιν

The adverb πάλιν, which occurs in all eight texts of my corpus, will be extensively discussed.<sup>164</sup> Πάλιν is worthy of such a detailed investigation because of two reasons in particular: first, it has adopted features of the ancient P2 particles; secondly, it survives as a DM in certain Modern Greek dialects, as I will show in an excursus.

#### *General information*

To my knowledge, only one researcher has devoted a separate article to the different uses of πάλιν: Puigdollers (2006). Although focusing on Ancient Greek, Puigdollers (2006: 467) has pointed to the underlying potential of πάλιν to develop procedural meanings:

“A remarkable fact about all these different meanings is that apparently there is a significant diachronic development: the more the texts advance in time, the more the adverb moves upwards from more internal positions (argument) to more external ones. In this regard Ancient Greek seems to coincide with the evolution of similar expressions in other languages from a more specific meaning to a more abstract one”

Puigdollers (2006: 464) even uses the term DM to describe (one of the uses of) πάλιν. More concretely, he says that the adverb might sometimes work as a topic switch marker. Nonetheless, he explicitly adds that this is a rather extraordinary phenomenon and belongs to a late development (2<sup>nd</sup> c. BC Polybios and 2<sup>nd</sup> c. AD Loukianos) (Puigdollers 2006: 468). By the time my corpus is composed, though, πάλιν has fully developed its procedural meaning. Hence, it can be found on Egea’s (1993: 115f.) list (cf. 5.3.2.1). Vejleskov (2005: 206f.), who is investigating the LMG prose works the *Greek Portulans* and the *Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans*, also suggests a (vague) difference between πάλι “as a genuine adverb” and πάλι “not as a genuine adverb”.

#### *Semantics & syntax*

Many meanings of the adverb πάλιν circulate, as is typical for DMs (cf. supra 2.5.1.5). Puigdollers (2006: 455) speaks of “the difficulties of describing its several meanings”. Concise dictionaries often only list the evident – conceptual – ones (cf. Mateos 1994). As such, Egea (1993: 112) complains about lacunas in the lemmas on πάλιν: “De πάλιν le

---

<sup>164</sup> For a less extensive version of this section on πάλιν, see Soltic (2013d).

dictionnaire dit seulement ἐπίρρημα ξανά, ἐκνέου/πίσω/ἐξάλλου, ἀντίθετα; ainsi il n'envisage pas ses valeurs emphatiques ou réponsives". However, the dictionary of Kriaras, the most comprehensive dictionary of the period under study, is more complete: five basic meanings ("back", "again", "on the other hand", "in turn" and "moreover") and several further nuances are distinguished:

1)

α) (Τοπ., συνηθέστ. με ρ. κίνησης) πίσω, προς τα πίσω

β) (πλεοναστικά, με ρ. που ήδη περικλείουν την έννοια «πίσω»)

2) (Χρον.) ξανά, πάλι, εκ νέου, ακόμη μία φορά

α) (για να δηλωθεί επανάληψη μιας πράξης ή επιστροφή σε προηγούμενη κατάσταση):

β) (πλεοναστικά, με ρ. που ήδη περικλείουν την έννοια «ξανά»):

γ) (στην αρχή αφήγησης για να εισαγάγει τη συνέχεια ενός κεφαλαίου η εξιστόρηση του οποίου είχε διακοπεί): φρ. αλλάττω (ή αλλάσσω) πάλιν τον λόγον (μου), βλ. αλλάσσω ΓΑ1 φρ.

δ) (σε ιδιάζ.χρ., για να δώσει έμφαση): (στο τέλος μιας μεγάλης αφήγησης):

3) (Με αντιθετική σημασ.)

α) (μόνο του ή έπειτα από ονόματα προσώπων και προσωπ. αντων.) εξάλλου, από το άλλο μέρος, όμως

β) (συνοδευόμενο από το σύνδ. και σε υποθ. πρόταση που αποτελεί αντίθεση προς μια προηγ. υποθ. πρόταση) αν όμως

γ) (μόνο του ή συνηθέστ. με το και ή το μα σε πρόταση που εκφράζει ισχυρή αντίθεση προς μια άλλη προηγ. πρόταση) μολαταύτα, εντούτοις, παρόλ' αυτά

4) (Για να δηλωθεί αμοιβαιότητα, διαδοχή, χρονική ακολουθία) με τη σειρά, στη συνέχεια, έπειτα

5) (Με προσθετική σημασ.) ακόμη, επίσης, επιπλέον (σε προεξαγγελτική παράθεση): (για να εισαγάγει νέο κεφάλαιο στην αφήγηση)

Applied to πάλιν, the first two meanings which Kriaras' dictionary has distinguished can be considered purely conceptual: a spatial one ("Τοπ."; "back") and a temporal one ("Χρον." "again"). The remaining meanings ("on the other hand", "in turn", "moreover") rather point to a procedural meaning, as their English equivalents suggest (cf. Rouchota 1998).

Πάλιν occurs no fewer than 872 times, i.e. almost 3 times per 100 verses, and is thus the most frequent adverbial DM in my corpus. Let us consider its position.



Table 11 Position of *πάλιν*

Total number of instances of <i>πάλιν</i> : 872	
IU-initial: 457	Verse-initial: 279
	Postcaesural: 178
IU-interrupting <sup>165</sup> : 415	P2: 372
	Non P2: 43

The adverb under scrutiny thus displays much positional flexibility, yet its precise position seems linked to its meaning. Slightly more than half of the instances (457/872) occur IU-initially. It seems that in this position, i.e. P1, *πάλιν* usually has its purely conceptual meaning: “back” or “again”. The following 2 examples respectively represent this spatial and temporal meaning:

(1) μὴ ν’ ἀνασάνω τίποτε # καὶ πάλιν νὰ γυρίσω (IM 178)

(2) Ἀκούει ταῦτα ἡ λυγερή, # ὀλιγωρᾷ καὶ πίπτει·  
πάλιν συμφέρει, ἐγέρνεται, # κλαίει καὶ ἀναστενάζει (PP 1751-1752)

“Ad-verbial” can be taken literally here: in its conceptual sense, *πάλιν* takes scope over a *verb* (“return” and “regain consciousness” in the 2 above examples).<sup>166</sup>

The non-IU-initial instances of *πάλιν* (415/872) are often more difficult to translate, which suggests that they have a more procedural meaning. Very interestingly, almost 90% (372/415) of these non-initial examples of *πάλιν* occur immediately after the first word/constituent of the IU and are thus found at P2. In this position, *πάλιν* functions as a DM. Contrary to all the above discussed adverbial DMs, procedural *πάλιν* thus tends to occupy P2 instead of the “prototypical” P1. Indeed, it is P1 that is usually acknowledged as the “place to be” for adverbial DMs, since initial position reflects the syntactic independence typical of DMs (cf. supra 2.5.2.3). Nonetheless, P2 is not at all a “pragmatically neutral” position in (the history of) Greek, for it is the common place for the ancient Wackernagel particles (cf. supra 4.2.1.2.1):

“Many discourse markers occur in syntactically marginal positions in the clause; whether it is the right or the left margin depends in part on the word order of the language in question. In Eng. [English] they tend to occur on the left margin (though they can occur in other places as well); in Jp. [Japanese] they may be on

<sup>165</sup> The few instances of IU-final *πάλιν* are reckoned among the IU-interrupting class.

<sup>166</sup> Cf. Mateos (1994: 68).

the right or the left. In other languages such as Gk. [Greek] they occur in what is often referred to as ‘Wackernagel’s position’, as the second element of the clause” (Traugott & Dasher 2001: 156; my italics)<sup>167</sup>

Moreover, *πάλιν* and the preceding (P1) word are sometimes syntactically detached from the rest of the utterance by a parenthetical (cf. supra 2.5.2.3). This parenthetical mostly takes the form of a verb, such as *λέγω σας* or *ἤξευρε* (cf. infra 5.3.4):

(3) Τοῦτο δὲ *πάλιν*, λέγω σας, # ἐπαρηγόρει τούτους (BT 5345)<sup>168</sup>

(4) Ἡ Ἑλένη *πάλιν*, λέγω σας, # ἡ τούτων ἀνταδέλφη (BT 2064)<sup>169</sup>

(5) Τούτην δὲ *πάλιν*, λέγω σας, # τῆς σύμιξης τὴν μέραν (BT 9389)<sup>170</sup>

(6) Ἄλλ’ οὗτος *πάλιν* ἤξευρε # τόσα νὰ τὸν συντύχη (BT 11874)

(7) Ὁ Αἴας *πάλιν*, ἤξευρε, # τόσα ἦτον χολιασμένος (BT 12772)<sup>171</sup>

However, one time it is a vocative:

(8) Καὶ ἐγὼ *πάλιν*, παιδίά μου, # ὅσο μπορῶ, νὰ πράττω (LR 2767)

### Pragmatics

The positional difference between the adverbial DMs analysed so far (P1) and *πάλιν* (P2) seems to reflect a functional difference: although *λοιπόν*, *πλήν*, *ἐδά(ρτε)*, *ἐνταῦθα*, *ἐν τούτῳ*, *ἀπ(’)αὐτοῦ* as well as *πάλιν* can all be analysed as DMs operative at the textual level (rather than the interpersonal one), *πάλιν* seems active on a more local level: it marks a *sentence* topic switch instead of a *discourse* topic switch. The notion of topic should here thus be interpreted in its proper linguistic sense, as opposed to focus (cf. supra 2.4.2). Before giving some clear examples involving a switch, I will first show that *πάλιν* tends to mark topicalised information. For this purpose, I have investigated after which kind of elements non-initial *πάλιν* follows. In other words: what is the nature of

<sup>167</sup> Rather than P2 in the *clause*, the Wackernagel particles occupy P2 in the *IU*; cf. supra 4.2.1.2.1. Of course, both concepts often coincide; cf. supra 2.3.3.

<sup>168</sup> Note the particle *δέ*; cf. infra.

<sup>169</sup> This verse is right indented in the edition.

<sup>170</sup> Note the particle *δέ*; cf. infra.

<sup>171</sup> This verse too is right indented in the edition.

the – usually P1 – words which precede *πάλιν*? If we are asking after the nature of words, we should make a distinction between their grammatical role and their word class:

Table 12 Grammatical role of the word before non-initial *πάλιν*

Total	415
Subject	135
Modifier	126
Predicate	70
Rest (vocative, parenthetical, conjunction, negation)	45
Object	39

Table 13 Word class of the word before non-initial *πάλιν*

Total	415
Pronoun	101
Adverb	93
Noun	77
Verb	70
Adjective	45
Conjunction <sup>172</sup>	28
Negation	4
Preposition	1

Especially the classification according to word class is revealing: more than 25% (101/415) of the words before non-initial *πάλιν* are pronouns, either strong personal pronouns such as *ἐγώ* or demonstrative pronouns such as *ἐκεῖνος*. I repeat that pronouns constitute prototypical examples of referentially given or active information, since they are only used if their referent has already been given in discourse – or their referent should be at least derivable from the context (Ziv 1994: 634).<sup>173</sup> As extensively discussed in the theoretical chapter (cf. supra 2.4.1) and in the section on clitic doubling (cf. supra 5.2.3.3.1), there exists an empirical correlation between referential givenness and topicalised information. As such, the observation that non-initial *πάλιν* tends to

<sup>172</sup> I have also reckoned the particle *νά* among this category.

<sup>173</sup> Cf. Gundel, Hedberg & Zacharski (1993: 278); cf. supra 2.4.1.

occur after pronouns suggests that it prefers to follow topicalised information, for instance:

(9) Τοσαῦτα πάλιν λέγοντα # εὐθειάνουν τὰ καράβια (BT 12077)

(10) Καὶ ἐμέναν πάλιν μετ' αὐτοῦ # ἐπαίρνει νὰ ὑπαγαίνη (LR 3041)

(11) Ἀπ' αὐτὴν πάλιν ἔστεκεν # ἡ Ταπεινοφροσύνη (LR 841)

(12) Ἐλα ἐσὺ ἐκ τὴν μίαν μερέαν # κ' ἐγὼ πάλε ἀπ' τὴν ἄλλην (CoM H 7001)

In complete accordance with the semantic characteristics of DMs, it is often difficult to translate πάλιν in these examples: the conceptual meanings “again” or “back” make no sense (cf. supra 2.5.1.5). The procedural meanings “on the other hand” or “in turn” might constitute a more appropriate translation. This is definitely the case when the grammatical role of the pronoun is subject. As a matter of fact, in the majority of the examples involving a pronoun, the pronoun constitutes the grammatical subject:<sup>174</sup>

(13) οὐδὲ ἐκείνη πάλι αὐτὸν # διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειάν του (IM 742)

(14) Ἐκεῖνος πάλιν σύντομα # τὸν ῥήγα κατελάλει (VC 754)

(15) ὅλον νὰ ἔχη ἀπὸ ἐμέν, # καὶ ἐγὼ πάλε ἀπ' ἐκεῖνον (BT 9131)

(16) Κ' ἐκεῖνος πάλε ἐπέρασεν # εἰς τῆς Πολέου τὰ μέρη (CoM H 1290)

(17) κ' ἐτοῦτοι πάλε εἰς ἐσὲν # νὰ τοὺς κρατῆς εἰς δίκαιον (CoM H 7920)

Two other facts confirm the observation that πάλιν tends to follow topicalised information. If we examine the adverbs and adjectives preceding πάλιν more closely, we observe that i) the adverbs typically have demonstrative value; ii) both the adjectives and adverbs often involve a form of the adjective ἄλλος (“another”) or an ordinal number.

As for the adverbs (93 in total), no fewer than 71 are demonstrative adverbs of a spatial (“here”, “there”, ...) or of a temporal (“now”, “then”, ...) nature:<sup>175</sup>

(18) Ἐδῶθεν πάλε ὁ Τρώϊλος # μὲ τὸ καλὸν ἀλλάγιν (BT 4402)

---

<sup>174</sup> Cf. Mateos (1994: 79).

<sup>175</sup> Other examples include ἀπέδω, ἀπεκεῖ, ἐδῶ, ἐκεῖ, (ἐξ)οπίσω, ἐπάνωθεν, ἔσωθεν, νῦν, τότε, etc.

(19) ἐκεῖσε πάλιν ἔστρεψεν # ἔνθα τὸ πρῶτον εἶδε (VC 730)

As such, these adverbs are closely related to the above mentioned demonstrative pronouns and accordingly present referentially given and thus topicalised information.

The same holds for the adjective ἄλλος. This adjective refers back to a known “other one” and thus implies topicalised information, as the lemma of ἄλλος in the LSJ illustrates: “another, i.e. one besides what has been mentioned”. No fewer than 31 words (mostly adjectives, but also adverbs) preceding πάλιν contain a form of ἄλλος:

(20) Ἀνθενωρίδα ἤκουεν # ἡ μία, καὶ ἡ ἄλλη πάλιν (BT 1292)

(21) ἄλλοτε πάλιν ἔπλεκαν # οἱ Ἑρωτες τὰ ἄνθη (AB 868)

(22) καὶ ἄλλοι πάλιν βασιλεῖς # ἐξήκοντα καὶ πλέον (BT 4701)

(23) ὥρα κερδίζει διαφορά # κι ἄλλη πάλιν νὰ χάνη. (CoM H 4955)

(24) κι ἄλλα πάλιν ἀναμένασιν # νὰ ἔλθῃ ὁ καιρός τους. (CoM H 886)

Moreover, πάλιν is found 13 times after an ordinal number, which can be said to function in a similar way to ἄλλος, implying an already mentioned “former one”:

(25) ἡ πρώτη Κασπιόνισσα, # ἡ δευτέρα Περσικά,  
ἡ τρίτη πάλιν λέγεται # ἡ τῆς Τιβεριάδος,  
ἡ τετάρτη Ἀλφάτινος, # Ῥουβροῦμ ἡ πέμπτη πάλιν (BT 10572-10574)

In sum, pronouns (101), demonstrative adverbs (71) and ἄλλος and the like (44) are all truly indicative of referentially given and thus topicalised information. Revealingly, these words constitute almost half (216/415) of the total of words preceding non-initial πάλιν. However, the thesis that πάλιν constitutes a sentence topic switch marker might also be valid with regard to the *other* non-initial examples of πάλιν.

I have now sufficiently illustrated the first part of my statement, namely that πάλιν marks *topicalised* information. Now, I will focus on the second part: πάλιν involves a *switch* in so-called sentence topic. Especially with regard to pronouns exerting the grammatical role of subject, i.e. pronominal subjects, the switch is obvious, as the previous verse often contains another grammatical subject, for instance:

(26) οἱ Ἑρωτες μὲ ἐφόνευσαν # καὶ κατετρώσασίν με.  
Ἐγὼ πάλιν τοὺς Ἑρωτας # νὰ τοὺς παρακαλέσω (AB 973-974)

It is instructive to repeat that it is not necessary to express the pronominal subject of the first or second person from a grammatical point of view in Greek (cf. *supra* 5.1.3.3).

Syntactically speaking, ἐγώ is thus superfluous, for the subject is perfectly derivable from the verbal morphology of παρακαλέσω. Consequently, the presence of the pronoun must be pragmatically motivated: the speaker clearly wants to emphasise the (shift in) subject: “as in any (so-called) ‘empty subject’ or ‘pro-drop’ language, full pronoun subjects in Later Medieval Greek should be an indication that there is emphasis placed on the subject” (Pappas 2001: 84). Often, another pronominal subject is found in the immediate context:<sup>176</sup>

(27) καὶ ἐγὼ πολλὰ ἐξέταξα # καὶ ἀνερώτησά τον  
καὶ ἐκεῖνος πάλιν εἶπε με # μέρος διὰ τοῦ Λιβίστρου (LR 3182-3183)<sup>177</sup>

(28) ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ Τελαμώνιος # μετὸν λαόν μας ὅλον  
ἐμπρὸς ᾧς ὑπαγαίνωμεν• # καὶ σὺ πάλε ἐξοπίσω (BT 864-865)

(29) Κ' ἐκεῖνοι πάλε ἐποίκασιν # υἱὸν καὶ θυγατέρα·  
Ἀράρδος ἄκουε ὁ υἱός, # Ἀνέζα ἡ θυγάτηρ,  
τὴν ὅποιαν εὐλογήθηκεν # διὰ ὁμόζυγον γυναῖκαν  
ὁ μισὴρ Στένης τὸ ὄνομα # καὶ Μαῦρος τὸ ἐπὶ κλην.  
Κ' ἐκείνη πάλε ἐγέννησεν # υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρες (CoM H 8463-8467)

(30) Ἐγὼ πατήρ σου εὐρίσκομαι, # ἐσὺ δέ πάλιν υἱός μου (BT 11309)

As the last example indicates, the distribution of the P2 particle δέ is also interesting in this respect. As for Homeric Greek, the function of δέ was described in terms of continuation (a linking device between successive IUs; cf. supra 2.3.3). In Classical Greek, though, δέ could be used as a sentence topic switch marker. Bakker (1993), for instance, speaks of “an intrasentential subject topic switch”. Departing from Bakker, Scheppers (2011: 413) claims that δέ could signal “topic-switches on sentence level” in Classical Greek. Thus, the fact that non-initial πάλιν is in almost 10% (38/415) of the cases accompanied by δέ strengthens the view that πάλιν involves a topic switch:

(31) Ἐγὼ δέ πάλιν ἔκραξα # τοὺς πρώτους τῶν δαιμόνων (LR 2611)

(32) Νῦν δέ πάλιν ὀρίζουσιν: # «Νὰ σέβης 'ς ἄλλον σπῖτιν (LR 478)

(33) Τὴν τρίχαν μόνον ἔπαρε, # αὐτὸν δέ πάλιν ἄφες (BT 586)

<sup>176</sup> In these examples, we might even argue that πάλιν functions as a *contrastive* topic switch marker.

<sup>177</sup> Note that the postverbal position of the OCP με confirms our procedural interpretation; cf. supra 5.3.2.1.

(34) ἄλλην δὲ πάλιν ἔγραψεν # ἀρχόντισ<σ>αν γυναῖκα (VC 361)

(35) Οἱ μὲν καλῶς ἐλέγασιν # ἔποικεν ὁ Ὀρέστης,  
οἱ δὲ πάλιν ἐλέγασιν # πολλὰ κακὸν τὸ ἐποίησεν (BT 13491-13492)<sup>178</sup>

In the above examples, the ancient DM (δέ) and the newly developed one (πάλιν) clearly reinforce each other. This reminds us of the (strongly inferential) combination λοιπὸν (new) οὖν (ancient), which has been identified by Thrall (1962: 27) for New Testamentic Greek (cf. supra 5.3.3.1.1).<sup>179</sup> Interestingly, the example under 3a in the lemma of Kriaras contains both a shift in pronominal subject (from ἐκεῖνοι to ἡμεῖς) and a particle δέ. As such, it provides us with another genuine example of πάλιν as a topic switch marker:

ἐκεῖνοι τα λαβράκια..., ἡμεῖς δὲ πάλιν τρώγομεν αὐτὸ το πῶς το λέγουν (Προδρ. IV 412)

Once, a sole particle δέ even serves as the equivalent of πάλιν in parallel manuscript P, so that both seem mutually exchangeable:<sup>180</sup>

(36) κι ὡς εἶδαν πάλε ὅτι ἔφυγαν # κ' ἐπιάσαν τὰ βουνία (CoM H 4852)

cf. ὡς εἶδαν δὲ ὅτι ἔφυγαν # κ' ἠπῆραν τὰ βουνία (CoM P 4852)

Furthermore, it again strikes the eye that quite a few verses containing πάλιν are right indented in the editions. As for the extensive edition of the *War of Troy* carried out by Papathomopoulos & E. Jeffreys (1996), of the 236 verses containing a non-initial instance of πάλιν, no fewer than 34 start a new paragraph, for example:

(37) Ὁ Θέσεος τὸν εὐχαριστεῖ, # ἐπῆρεν, ὑπαγαίνει.  
Θόας πάλιν ὁ βασιλεὺς # μὲ τοὺς Καλκεδονίτας,  
Φιλιθοᾶς ὁ βασιλεὺς # μὲ δέκα χιλιάδες (BT 3787-3789) (page 197)

(38) καλλιώτερη οὐκ ἐγίνετον # εἰς φρόνεσιν, εἰς γνῶσιν.  
Καὶ αὐτοὶ πάλιν παρακαλοῦν # τὸν Πρίαμον γνησίως (BT 12020-12021) (page 612)

(39) βασιλέα τὸν ἔστεψεν # ὁ καλὸς Μενεστέας.  
Καὶ τότε πάλιν ἄκουσε # ξενοχάραγον θαῦμα• (BT 13557-13558) (page 676)

<sup>178</sup> Note the ancient μέν-δέ opposition.

<sup>179</sup> Cf. πλήν δέ supra 5.3.3.1.2.

<sup>180</sup> However, this example does not belong to one of the typical word classes of topicalised information (such as pronouns), but involves a verb.

(40) παρακαλοῦν τον θλιβερά # τοὺς ἄνδρας τους μὴ θλίψη.

Ἡ Ἑλένη πάλιν λέγει τον # ἐκ βάθους εὐχαρίστως (BT 1915-1916) (page 98)<sup>181</sup>

(41) ἔως οὗ νὰ ἔβγουν οἱ σύνταξες ὅλες ἀπὸ τὴν πόλιν.

Δευτέρα πάλιν σύνταξις # ἦσαν τρεῖς βασιλεῖς (BT 3243-3244) (page 168)

Interestingly, editor E. Jeffreys considers a procedural use of πάλιν in the *War of Troy* plausible (p.c. 19/11/2012): “The word πάλιν seems to me to have several usages in the *War of Troy*, though I have never set them out systematically: discourse marking may well be one of them”.

Another argument in favour of a DM-like interpretation is that modern translators of the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry often have difficulties to translate πάλιν appropriately. A random check learns that various translations of πάλιν occur, of which some certainly point to its use as DM: “in turn” and “in reply”, but also “then” is a popular English equivalent; as regards Italian, we have found “poi” and “allora”. Egea often renders πάλιν by “y”, which simply means “and”, for example:

(42) {Καὶ} Τότε πάλιν τὸν Φίλαρμον, # τὸν κάλλιστον τὸν νέον (VC 83)

Egea (1998: 62): “Y entonces a Filarmo, el bellísimo joven”

(43) Ἐκείνη πάλιν πρὸς αὐτὸν # ἀντέφησε τοιάδε (VC 856)

Egea (1998: 106): “Y ella le contestó palabras tales”

This corresponds with Lurier’s translation:

(44) δεύτερον πάλε ἀπ’ αὐτὸν # τὸν Παντουήν ἐκεῖνον (CoM H 421)

Lurier (1964: 79): “and second after him Baudouin”

If Lurier gives a translation, he again chooses out of many options: “moreover”, “furthermore”, “again”, “next”, “in (his) turn”, “then”, “still”, “further”, “on the other hand” to name but a few. Let me give some examples:

(45) Δεύτερον πάλιν θλίβομαι, ἔχω μεγάλην ἔννοιαν (CoM H 1817)

Lurier (1964: 123): “Furthermore, I am also grieved and I feel great uneasiness”

(46) τοὺς ἄλλους πάλε ἐσκότωσαν # κ’ ἐρρουχολόγησάν τους. (CoM H 4091)

Lurier (1964: 192): “and the rest, moreover, they killed and plundered”

---

<sup>181</sup> Note that the postverbal position of the OCP τον once more confirms our procedural interpretation; cf. supra 5.3.2.1.



- (47) καὶ ἄλλοι πάλε ἐλέγασιν # ὅτι ἡ ἀφιορκία ποῦ ἐποιήσεν (CoM H 4796)  
Lurier (1964: 211): “and still others said that that the perjury comitted”

Even more revealingly, *πάλιν* is sometimes left untranslated, for instance:

- (48) Ἄλλος πάλε ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ # ἔγραφεν στὸ βιβλίον (CoM H 1935)<sup>182</sup>  
Lurier (1964: 126): “After him another was next listed in the book”
- (49) καὶ δεύτερον πάλε ἀπὸ αὐτὸ # τὸ ἔπαινος τοῦ κόσμου (CoM H 3984)  
Lurier (1964: 188): “and second after this, to save the praise”
- (50) Ἐγὼ δὲ πάλιν τὴν βουλὴν # ἔμαθα τοῦ πατρός μου (LR 2956)  
Betts (1995: 160): “But I learnt of my father’s plan”
- (51) Ἐγὼ δὲ πάλιν δουλικῶς # ἀνταποκρίνομαί τον (LR 2960)  
Betts (1995: 161): “I dutifully replied to him”
- (52) ἄλλον πάλιν ὡς ἄνανδρον # ποδοσιδηρωμένον (VC 342)  
Betts (1995: 11): “Another was of a man with his feet in irons”  
Cupane (1995: 249): “un altro rappresentava un uomo con i ferri ai piedi”  
Egea (1998: 76): “otro, como figura de hombre, los pies encadenados”

### *Prosody*

Furthermore, my interpretation of non-initial *πάλιν* as a DM is also supported by prosodic arguments. At first sight, this might be surprising given the nature of my corpus. However, thanks to their metrical nature the texts under investigation are not completely deprived of prosodic information. Interestingly, the accented syllable of non-initial *πάλιν* is sometimes found at odd-numbered syllables. As I have repeatedly warned, not all accents underlie a prosodic reality. Remember, for instance, the artificial nature of the accent on the P2 particles or on preverbal OCPs (cf. supra 4.1.1.1). As such, the accented syllables of these words can appear at uneven positions without any problem. Rather than interrupting the iambic rhythm of the πολιτικὸς στίχος, the occurrence of *πάλιν* at odd-numbered syllables should be seen in this light: it points to the adverb’s unstressed character, which is a common feature of DMs (cf. supra 2.5.3.1). In the next 2 examples *πά* respectively appears at the 3<sup>rd</sup> and at the 11<sup>th</sup> syllable:<sup>183</sup>

<sup>182</sup> Note the editorial right indentation.

<sup>183</sup> According to the rules of Modern Greek prosody it is natural that the accent on *πά* is weak in the above examples: “when there are two adjacent stressed syllables in a line, the stress of the one syllable is lost or

(53) Ἐγὼ πάλιν τοὺς Ἑρωτας # νὰ τοὺς παρακαλέσω (AB 974)

(54) πεζεύουν, προσκυνοῦσιν τον # καὶ ἐμὲν πάλιν ὁμοίως (LR 3054)

The unstressed character of πάλιν has already been suggested by Egea (1993: 112): “peut-être pourrait-on entendre une accentuation οὐδέ παλιν νὰ βλέπω”.

Moreover, πάλιν contains only two syllables and can be phonologically reduced to πάλι or πάλε, for instance:<sup>184</sup>

(55) κ' ἐγὼ πάλε νὰ ἀποθαρρῶ # τὰ πάντα μου εἰς ἐσένα. (CoM H 1872)

(56) κ' ἐγὼ πάλε νὰ σᾶς βοηθῶ # ἀπ' ὅσον κάμνει χρεῖαν. (CoM H 2718)

However, it should be noted that final -ν was labile in LMG (Browning 1999<sup>2</sup>: 81). In any case, if one of these two shorter alternative forms is followed by a vowel-initial word, it usually undergoes elision. Hence, it becomes monosyllabic (πάλ'):

(57) Ἡμεῖς πάλε ὀρεγόμεθεν # ἀνάπαυσιν τοῦ κόπου (BT 5479)

(58) ἀπ' αὐτοὺς εἶχα τὴν τιμὴν, # αὐτοὶ πάλε ἐξ ἐμένα (BT 7422)

(59) Καὶ τότε πάλ' ἐστάθηκεν # ἡ τροπὴ τοῦ φουσσάτου (BT 9642)

### Excursus: Modern Greek dialects: *pa(l)*

In some Modern Greek dialects, namely Pontic, Cappadocian and Mariupol Greek, the DM πάλιν seems to live on in an even more reduced form. These three dialects belong to the same dialect group from a diachronic point of view: Drettas (1999: 91) speaks of “a typical dialect group of eastern Greek”.

#### *Pontic*

In Pontic, a “suffixed particle” *pa(l)* exists which is said to be etymologically related to the Ancient Greek adverb πάλιν (Kaltsa & Sitaridou 2010: 261).<sup>185</sup> Very interestingly, it

---

weakened to such a degree that it is no longer counted. The lost stress depends on the metre of the whole line: if the line is iambic then the stress of the odd syllable is lost” (Parides 2009: 20; fn 57).

<sup>184</sup> It might be interesting to note that the phonological reduction into πάλε is filtered out by manuscript P: while H contains no fewer than 74 instances, P has only one.

<sup>185</sup> Cf. Papadopoulos (1961: 138); Drettas (1999: 435); Janse (2002: 225f.).

In some parts of Pontus they use *pa*, while in others they use *pal*. In the variety of Sarachos/Uzungöl, for instance, *pal* is used.

has already been noted that the use of *pa(l)* is an extremely frequent strategy to indicate topics (Kaltsa & Sitaridou 2010: 263). Therefore, Drettas (1999: 434) calls it a “particule de thématization forte”: *pa(l)* constitutes a “postposition atone qui se joint au dernier élément ou à l’élément unique d’un segment thématique” (Drettas 1999: 434). As such, it has been related to the ancient P2 particles:

“Ancient Greek, like most Wackernagel languages, was rich in different sentential enclitics like *μεν, δέ, γάρ*, etc. A dialectal trace of such elements, under the form of *pa* is found in Pontic” (Ralli 2006: 131f.)

These definitions are inevitably reminiscent of the use of non-initial *πάλιν* in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry. Moreover, the examples which Drettas (1999: 436ff.), an expert on Pontic, discusses show striking resemblances with my examples of non-initial *πάλιν*, as the majority involves a pronoun:

e'nkalesanaten son-vasi'lean |  
e'kinos-pa | a'ntonios 'etone ton-ke'ron e'kinon  
“On la convoqua devant le roi.  
Celui-là –c’était Antonius, à cette époque là–” (Drettas 1999: 436; ex. 93)

i-θaya'terat | e'kine-pa | e'kine | 'kja 'enton kalo'yrea |  
e'kine-pa k<sup>h</sup>-e'seven so-mana'stir  
“Sa fille... ben, celle-là... et bien elle est devenue religieuse, celle-là,  
(mais) elle n'alla pas au couvent, celle-là” (ibid.; ex. 94)

e'mis 'erθam asi-xuči'lin | ason-'ponton ||  
e'kin-pa 'erθan asin-ru'sian  
“Nous, nous sommes venus de Xušilí, du Pont.  
Quant à eux, ils sont venus de Russie” (Drettas 1999: 437; ex. 95)

e'yo-pa 'leyose 'leyose mi-ka'pnijs |  
“Et moi, je te dis, je te dis ne fume pas” (Drettas 1999: 443; ex. 111)

However, “la thématization forte d’un circonstant” (Drettas 1999: 442), either of a spatial or of a temporal nature, is also possible, which in turn constitutes a clear parallel with my examples of *πάλιν* after demonstrative adverbs. In Papadopoulos’ Pontic text fragments, I have also found some examples of *pa(l)* after a form of ἄλλος, for instance :

καὶ γὰρ τ' ἄλλο πα εἶπεν (Papadopoulos 1955: 206)

Furthermore, it has been noted that *pa(l)* often causes translational problems, just like *πάλιν*:

“les quelques ponticophones qui ont écrit sur leur dialecte, ont eu beaucoup de difficulté à présenter le fonctionnement du /-pa/ de façon claire et, surtout, à le traduire en *dhimotiki* ou en *katharévusa*” (Drettas 1999: 435)

In the last chapter of his Pontic grammar, Papadopoulos (1955: 182ff.) provides some Pontic text fragments with a literal Modern Greek translation. He always translates *pa(l)* as *καί*, except once. As a matter of fact, in his Pontic lexicon, Papadopoulos (1961: 138) suggests the equivalence of *pa(l)* and *καί*: “3) ‘Ως σύνδ. ἐπιδοτικὸς ἴσον μὲ τὸ καί τίθεται μετὰ τὴν λέξιν καὶ ἐγκλίνεται: Ἐγὼ παλ’ θέλω. Ἐκεῖνος παλ’ εἶδεν ἄτο. Ἄμον ντὸ εἶπα σε ἐγὼ, ἐσύ πα ἄέτσο’ ποῖσον”. As these examples already show, pronouns are very popular candidates for *pa(l)* to attach to in his corpus; 2 more examples include:

Ἐκεῖνη πα εἶπε ἐμένα (Papadopoulos 1955: 184)

ἐγὼ πα ἄέτσο’ θὰ ἐποιν’να (Papadopoulos 1955: 198)

Strikingly, with regard to the isolated instance in which Papadopoulos (1955: 219) does not translate *pa(l)* as *καί*, he gives *λοιπόν* as its Modern Greek equivalent!

### *Cappadocian*

Until now, it may seem that *pa(l)* is a uniquely Pontic phenomenon, i.e. the result of an idiosyncratic internal evolution within this dialect, as Joseph (1998: 211) suggests: “Pontic presents a ‘particule de thématization forte’, i.e. a topic marker, *pa*, which does not have a ready counterpart in other dialects”. Nevertheless, the phenomenon is more widespread. Cappadocian uses the particle *pal(i)* with a similar purpose: we observe “the use of *πάλιν* to introduce a fresh fact in the narrative, which is very characteristic of Pontic” (Dawkins 1916: 631; cf. Janse 2002: 225). I give 2 examples taken from Dawkins in which this use is very clear. The first involves the pronominal subjects of the first person “*γό*” and “*μίς*” (cf. “for my/our part”), the second the demonstrative adverb of space “*abidži*”:

xás ta maḍísi i xóra

“let the stranger reap”

γὸ páli a ipáu s’ istšáiḍi

“I for my part will go into the shade”

(...)

’s pái i xóra, maḍísi son temísi

“let the strange woman go reap in the heat”

mís páli a kátsumi s’ istšáiḍi

“we for our part will sit in the shade” (Dawkins 1916: 566f.)

írtami si férka  
 “we came to Férka”  
 (...)  
 abidží írtam so kséniti  
 “from there we came to Xéniti”  
 abidží páli írtam so xoríu, siŋ kíska  
 “from there we came back to the village, to Kíska” (Dawkins 1916: 568f.)

Interestingly, in his discussion of the distribution of OCPs in Cappadocian, Barri (1971: 293) distinguishes between a stressed form of *pal(i)* and an unstressed one, saying that the OCPs are preverbal if preceded by *pal(i)* “de nouveau”, “mais seulement quand il est fortement accentué” (Barri 1971: 293). We have pointed out that a distinction between the truly conceptual and possibly focalised adverb on the one hand (preverbal OCPs?) and the adverb functioning as a DM on the other (postverbal OCPs?) might indeed be revealing (cf. supra 5.3.2.1).

#### *Mariupol*

Moreover, Mariupol Greek as well has a particle *pa*. Kisilier, to my knowledge the only one who has studied Mariupol *pa* in depth, also tentatively compares it with the ancient P2 particles (Kisilier 2009: 160). According to Kisilier, Mariupol *pa* functions as an “emphatic marker”. However, it is not entirely clear to me how Kisilier conceives the concept of emphasis. Relying on the examples which he cite, I consider it plausible that he actually describes a phenomenon of the same kind as *pa(l)(i)* in Pontic and Cappadocian. Again, pronouns are likely candidates to precede *pa*:

Atós ōjáv’ ártá makrá, yó pa na páyu (Kisilier forthcoming: 2)  
 “he’s gone a long time ago [or far away], and I have to go as well”

Moreover, some demonstrative adverbs of space and time, such as *ađó* (“here”), are also often followed by *pa* (Kisilier forthcoming: 2). Interestingly, Kisilier points to the semantic shallowness of the particle: “It is not easy to find an appropriate equivalent to translate it” (Kisilier forthcoming: 2).

Unfortunately, not much more has been written about *pa(l)(i)* in the Modern Greek dialects. Further dialectal research on *pa(l)(i)* is thus highly required (cf. Ralli 2006: 132). Nonetheless, the available data strongly suggest that my interpretation of *πάλιν* as a topic switch marker is justified. The use of *pa(l)(i)* in Mariupol Greek, Cappadocian and especially Pontic is certainly comparable to the function of non-initial *πάλιν* in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry. It looks as if the origin of *pa(l)(i)* in the different contemporary

dialects can be traced back to LMG, as the following quotation suggests: “The use of *pa* as a discourse marker seems to be a clear case of grammaticalisation from an adverb (lexical) to a topic marker” (Kaltsa & Sitaridou 2010: 263; fn 3).<sup>186</sup>

### 5.3.4 Verbal DMs

Beside adverbial expressions, I have also identified two (types of) verbal expressions which can function as DMs in my corpus: the first person singular of the reporting verb λέγω (“I say”) (5.3.4.1) and the epistemic second person singular imperative γνώριζε (“know!”) (5.3.4.2).<sup>187</sup> In addition to discussing again the semantic & syntactic and pragmatic characteristics of each verb, I will also go more deeply into the metrical position of the verbs – on the other hand, the subheading “general information” is left out, since no previous literature exists on the functioning of these two verbs in LMG. On the basis of their remarkable preference for a position next to the caesura, I will, by way of conclusion, make a tentative comparison between these verbal DMs and filled pauses in modern spoken languages (5.3.4.3).

#### 5.3.4.1 Λέγω

##### 5.3.4.1.1 Semantics & syntax

In the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry, so-called reporting verbs, such as “to say” and “to tell” abound. Especially the first person singular present λέγω is a frequently used form. The strong personal subject pronoun ἐγώ is usually not expressed, Greek being a so-called pro-drop language (cf. supra 5.1.3.3). I have also taken into account the synonym λαλῶ.<sup>188</sup> Very often, these verbs are accompanied by a second person OCP, functioning as the indirect object: λέγω/λαλῶ σε/σου/σας and σέ/σοῦ/σᾶς λέγω/λαλῶ.

---

<sup>186</sup> One may rightly ask whether the procedural use of *πάλι* has completely disappeared in the modern standard language. To my knowledge, though, no secondary literature exists on the interpretation of *πάλι* as a possible DM in Standard Modern Greek. Triandaphylidis (1982: 274), for instance, simply ranks *πάλι* among the temporal adverbs.

<sup>187</sup> I have written an article on each of these verbs: see Soltic (2014b) and Soltic (forthcoming).

<sup>188</sup> By mentioning λέγω, I always mean λαλῶ as well.

Table 14 Frequency of the first person singular present “I say”

Total	527
λέγω	456
λαλῶ	71

To give a better impression of the frequency of this verb, compare these numbers with other verbs in the first person singular present: ἔχω (“I have”) occurs 230 times in these two texts; λέγω even surpasses the number of instances of θέλω (“I want”) (249 instances), which is not only used as a main verb, but also as an auxiliary. Strikingly, the *War of Troy* and the *Chronicle of Morea* account for no fewer than 406 instances (234 in the *War of Troy* and 172 in the *Chronicle of Morea*, including 60 examples of λαλῶ). Admittedly, these are the most lengthy texts (23,620/34,835 verses = 68%). Still, we would have expected 10% less occurrences proportionally (406/527 = 77%). More importantly, the DM-like use of λέγω especially occurs in these two texts and far less in the other texts of my corpus: only 15 of the 207 procedural instances occur outside the *War of Troy* and the *Chronicle of Morea*!

With regard to the adverbial DMs too, the *War of Troy* and the *Chronicle of Morea* were sometimes set apart as a group: the *War of Troy* and the *Chronicle of Morea* lack the same adverbial DMs (πλήν<sup>189</sup>), while others (ἀπ’αὐτοῦ and ἐδάρτε) are exclusive to them. It is relevant to remember that both texts are said to have been composed in the same geographical area, i.e. the Peloponnese. As such, this might point to – albeit subtle – dialectal differences (cf. supra 1.1.1.2.1 & 3.3.1.2).<sup>190</sup>

The verb λέγω may occur in character text, but is predominantly found in metanarrative text. In the next example, for instance, the poet informs us that he will shorten (συντέμνω, καταλείπω) the story:

- (1) Καὶ τί νὰ λέγω τὰ πολλὰ # καὶ οὐδὲν τὰ περικόπτω;  
 Συντέμνω ταῦτα τὸ λοιπόν, # τὰ πάντα καταλείπω. (AB 1640-1641)

He sometimes also emphasises the truth (τὴν ἀλήθειαν) of his words:

- (2) Λέγω σας τὴν ἀλήθειαν, # τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀποκάτω  
 πλεόν ἀποκοτώτερος # καβαλλάρης οὐκ ἦτον. (BT 3102-3103)

<sup>189</sup> Πλήν is also missing in the *Ilias Byzantina*, though; cf. supra 5.3.3.1.2.

<sup>190</sup> In this context, one might also recall the early traces of the development towards proclitic OCPs in the *War of Troy* and the *Chronicle of Morea*; cf. supra 4.2.2.2.2.

This explains why these forms of λέγω have – within a narratological framework – been related to the live oral composition that the πολιτικὸς στίχος poets attempt to evoke: the many references to the performing “I” and the listening “you” can be considered a strategy to maintain a bond typical of orality (cf. Shawcross 2009: 157ff.).<sup>191</sup>

From a modern linguistic point of view, though, there is much more to be said in respect to the precise uses of this seemingly ordinary verb. In what follows, I will argue that we should distinguish between a purely conceptual use of λέγω and a procedural, DM-like one. Let me first illustrate the former use, in which λέγω retains its original “message-conveying” meaning, such as in the 2 above examples. If the form in question has an argument such as a direct object (either a simple constituent such as τὰ πολλά in the first example below or a completive clause introduced by ὅτι as in the second one), the verb under scrutiny without doubt carries its full conceptual load (cf. supra 2.5.2.2):<sup>192</sup>

(3) Καὶ τί νὰ λέγω τὰ πολλά; # Κανείς οὐχ ὑπελείφθη. (BT 1098)

(4) Λέγω σας ὅτι ὁ Ἑκτορας # ἔπασεν ἐκ τὴν σέλλαν (BT 4531)

The same applies to adverbs or prepositional phrases with adverbial value (cf. supra 2.5.2.2). Typically, these verbal modifiers stress the truth and trustworthiness of what the poet is telling, so that the translation “I assure (you)” sometimes even becomes appropriate, for instance:

(5) ἐγὼ ἐξεύρω εἰς πληροφορίαν, # μὲ ἀλήθειαν σὲ τὸ λέγω (CoM H 1849)

(6) Δὲν ἔν’ καλὸν νὰ καυχισθῶ, # ὅμως θαρρῶ καὶ λέγω,  
τοῦτο πληροφορήθηκε, # μεθ’ ὅρκου σὲ τὸ λέγω (AB 215-216)

(7) “Φλώριε, μὰ τὴν πίστην μας, # ἀλήθειαν σὲ λέγω. (PP 1266)

This emphasis on the reliability of his words is indubitably caused by “the anxiety of the medieval story-teller that the audience should believe his narration” (Anaxagorou 1998: 137). Considerations on the length of his story are also often found in the context:

(8) Οὐκ ἤμπορῶ μακρολογεῖν, # λέγω σας ἐν συνόψει (BT 8561)

---

<sup>191</sup> Cf. Anaxagorou (1998: 64f.); cf. supra 1.1.2.2.1.

<sup>192</sup> The 2<sup>nd</sup> person OCP σε/σου/σας is treated as an exception: it forms part of the verb phrase and is not considered a true argument; cf. supra 4.2.1.2.4.



(9) Κοντὰ σὲ λέγω, λυγερή, # εἰς φυλακὴ μὲ βάνει (LR 3212)

Furthermore, other expressions nearby might also provide clues in favour of a conceptual interpretation. Consider, for instance, the following examples, in which a reference to the corresponding act of listening (ἀκούω) is made:

(10) Καὶ λέγει πρὸς τὸν Φλώριον, # ἄκουσον τὶ σὲ λέγω (PP 1458)

(11) Καὶ πάλιν κατορκίζω σε # ἀπάνου 'ς τὸ σπαθί σου,  
νὰ μὲ ἀκούσης τὸ λαλῶ, # τὸ θέλω νὰ ποιήσης (LR 3910-3911)

In sum, in all the above examples the act of speaking is emphasised, by the presence of arguments and adverbs and/or by contextual clues. As for these cases, λέγω can thus be said to possess its “normal” conceptual value, i.e. “I say (to you)” or “I tell (you)”.

Another means to distinguish the conceptual instances from the procedural ones is their position: we will see that the DM-like forms of λέγω are consistently used *parenthetically*, whereas this does not hold for the conceptual examples. As defined in the theoretical chapter (cf. supra 2.5.2.3), parenthetical verbs are verbs which are syntactically independent from the clause to which they are attached (Dehé & Kavalova 2007: 1). While in modern spoken languages this syntactic independence can usually be identified on the basis of prosodic means, with respect to my corpus of narrative texts, we are forced to rely on the context – more precisely: on the surrounding verbs – to attribute parenthetical status to a verb. Basically, parenthetical examples of λέγω will differ from the surrounding verbs in person and number (1<sup>st</sup> person singular vs. narrative 3<sup>rd</sup> person) and normally in tense as well (present tense instead of the narrative past). Therefore, a procedural interpretation is *excluded* in the next host of examples, in which λέγω is coordinated with one or more other first person singular verbs in the present tense. Often, these verbs are other reporting verbs or verbs related to the semantic field of “speaking”, which fortify the conceptual meaning of λέγω:<sup>193</sup>

(12) Τὴν λέξιν γὰρ ὅπου ἄρχισα # νὰ λέγω καὶ νὰ γράφω,  
θέλω νὰ σοῦ ἀφηγήσωμαι # ἕως οὔ νὰ τὴν πληρώσω. (CoM H 1263-1264)

(13) Ἐτοῦτοι ὅλοι, ὅπου μὲ ἀκούεις # καὶ λέγω κι ὀνομάζω (CoM H 1962)

---

<sup>193</sup> Cf. πληροφορῶ “I inform”, συμβουλεύω “I advise”, γράφω “I write”, ἀφηγοῦμαι “I narrate”, θαρρῶ “I believe confidently”, ὀρκίζω “I swear”, πλατύνω “I amplify”, μακρολογῶ “I expand”, παύομαι “I stop”.

Note that the coordination is *explicitly* expressed by means of the LMG coordinator *par excellence* καί (cf. supra 5.1.3.4). However, this should not be the case:

(14) Βλέπω τον, κράζω, λέγω τον: # «Γρηγόρησε καμπόσο (LR 3448)

(15) Έβγαίνω ἀπὸ τὴν τέντα μου, # θεωρῶ τοὺς ἐδικούς μου,  
λαλῶ τους, μιτριάζω τους, # καὶ ἐκεῖνοι μετὰ μένα (LR 1242-1243)

(16) Μετὰ ταῦτα ὁ πρίγκιπας, # ἐκεῖνος ὁ Γυλιάμος,  
τὰ πάντα ὅπου σὲ λαλῶ, # γράφω καὶ ἀφηγοῦμαι  
καὶ ἄλλα πλεῖστα καὶ πολλὰ, # τὰ οὐκ ἔμπορῶ σὲ γράφει,

### 5.3.4.1.2 Pragmatics

On the other hand, if used parenthetically, we can attribute procedural value to λέγω. This is the case for 207 of the 527 instances. As mentioned, the *War of Troy* and the *Chronicle of Morea* account for no fewer than 192 of these 207 DM-like instances. Note that I have again considered a full translation a surplus value (contrary to above, though, I propose my own translation also with regard to the *Chronicle of Morea* and do not rely on Lurier his).

If we are forced to classify these procedural parenthetical examples according to the modern binary distinction between interpersonal and textual DMs, they rather belong to the former category, contrary to the adverbial DMs (cf. supra 2.5.1.2 & 5.3.2.2.3). While the adverbial DMs are as topic switch markers closer to the category of textual DMs, procedural λέγω also guides the listener, as the addition of the explicit reference to the listener in the form of a second person pronoun σε/σου/σας shows (cf. Shawcross 2009: 157ff.).

More precisely, the main pragmatic function of procedural λέγω seems to signal a clarification on behalf of the speaker towards the listener. Of the 207 procedural examples, 69 have a clear clarification-signalling purpose: the majority signals an apposition (5.3.4.1.2.1). With regard to the other procedural examples, the poet “merely” wants to grab the attention of his audience (5.3.4.1.2.2). Although these two DM uses can of course not be separated from each other, I have arranged my examples into this twofold classification. This results in the following statistics:

Table 15 Procedural uses of λέγω

Total number of instances of procedural λέγω: 207	
Clarification-signalling: 69	Nominative apposition: 17
	Zero subject apposition: 10
	Accusative apposition: 32
	Genitive apposition: 10
Attention-grabbing: 138	

Furthermore, I will draw a tentative parallel with the verb φημί (5.3.4.1.2.3). Finally, I will point to another possible pragmatic function of λέγω in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry, namely its use as a direct speech marker (5.3.4.1.2.4).

#### 5.3.4.1.2.1 Clarification-signalling function

In this category, it seems that the poet realises too late – or at least wants to give that impression – that (a part of) his utterance is not completely straightforward or is ambiguous for the listener, so that a clarification is required if he wants his (real or imaginary) audience to understand his message properly. Λέγω signals this clarification, which normally takes the form of an apposition. Remember that appositions are considered typical of spoken language (Anaxagorou 1998: 139; cf. supra 5.1.3.3).<sup>194</sup> To begin with, the apposition can take the accusative case (32 examples):

- (17) Ὁ Ἀνθενώρ με τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, # τὸν καλὸν στρατιώτην,  
λέγω σας τὸν Πολυδάμᾱν, # ἦλθαν με τὸν λαόν τους (BT 5148-5149)  
 “Anthenor with his son, the beautiful soldier,  
 I tell you, Polydamas, came together with their people”

- (18) Καλὰ τυχαίνει ὁ Ἀχιλλεὺς # νὰ θλίβεται πολλάκις  
 “It happened that Achilles mourned often”  
 τί ἀπὸ ἐκεῖνον, λέγω σας, # τί ἀπὸ τὸν λαόν του,  
 because from him, I tell you, from his people,”  
 ὅτι καλὰ τοῦ ἐσκότωσαν # ἐκλεκτοὺς πεντακόσιους (BT 9767-9769)  
 “they killed 500 exquisite men”

<sup>194</sup> Once more, these appositions nicely occupy one of the two half-verses, which corroborates the hypothesis that we can compare them to IUs, for we have seen that an IU boundary is usually present immediately before afterthoughts and that appositions are a subcategory of the class of afterthoughts; cf. supra 5.1.3.3.

- (19) στρέφονται εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν, # λέγω τὸν Ἀγαμέμνων (BT 8809)  
“they return to their head, I say, Agamemnon”

Note that in the 2 of the 3 above examples λέγω (σας) is not surrounded by commas in the edition. The reason for this is presumably the fact that the clarifying accusative constituents are interpreted by the editors as direct objects of λέγω (“I speak about”). However, the examples which involve other cases than the accusative do not show such ambiguity and are usually placed between editorial commas, which point to the parenthetical status of the verbs (cf. supra 2.5.2.3). A genitive constituent too may, for instance, need clarification (10 examples):

- (20) ὁ πατὴρ τῆς πανέμοστης, # λέγω, τῆς Δηϊδάμας (BT 10827)  
“the father of the beautiful one, I say, Deidama”
- (21) νὰ γένη τέλεια δούλη του, # ἐγνήσια ἐδική του,  
“she would finally become his slave, his own slave,”  
εἰς θέλημάν του νὰ ἐλθῇ, # λέγω, τοῦ Βερδερίχου. (LR 2749-2750)  
“she would bend to his will, I say, (the will) of Verderichos”

Procedural λέγω can also mark a subject that is clarified, in which case we find an apposition in the nominative (17 examples):

- (22) Ὅταν δὲ ἐκατέλαβεν # ὁ βριαρόχειρ γίγας,  
“When the giant with the robust hands arrived,”  
λέγω σας δὲ ὁ Ἀχιλλεὺς # ὁ θαυμαστός, ὁ μέγας (BT 3174-3175)  
“I tell you, Achilles, the marvelous one, the great one”
- (23) Ὁ τῆς Αἰγύπτου ὁ βασιλεύς, # λέγω, ὁ Βερδερίχος,  
“The king of Egypt, I say, Verderichos,”  
μετὰ τοῦ μηχανήματος # καὶ μετὰ πανουργίας  
“with his trickery and craftiness”  
τὴν κόρην ἐπεχείρησεν # νὰ πάρῃ καὶ νὰ φύγῃ. (LR 2598-2600)  
“attempted to take the girl and escape”

As for the 2 examples above, the paraphrases ὁ βριαρόχειρ γίγας and ὁ τῆς Αἰγύπτου ὁ βασιλεύς are the subjects of ἐκατέλαβεν and ἐπεχείρησεν respectively. Λέγω σας twice introduces the proper name (ὁ Ἀχιλλεὺς and ὁ Βερδερίχος) to which this paraphrase actually refers.

However, we should also take into account examples in which the subject is not expressed, but in which a so-called zero pronoun is present. Note that English indispensably needs an explicit subject pronoun, which I have added in my translation between square brackets. In the next examples, the subject is present in the immediate context, yet in the meantime other possible subjects have been mentioned. In order to

avoid confusion, the poet then deems it necessary to make the subject again explicit (10 examples). In the following 2 passages, Polidamas and the Great Lord constitute the respective subjects:

- (24) Πολυδαμαῖς ἐσύγκρουσε # μετὰ τὸν Διομήδην,  
 “Polydamas came to blows with Diomedes,”  
 ἔπεσε ὁ Διομήδιος # ἐντάμα μὲ τὸν ἵππον•  
 “Diomedes fell together with his horse,”  
 ἐμπρὸς παρὰ νὰ σηκωθῇ, # ἐπῆρε του τὸν ἵππον,  
 “before he stood up, [he] took from him the horse,”  
 λέγω σας, ὁ Πολυδαμαῖς• # τὸν Τρώϊλον τὸν στέλνει. (BT 6216-6219)  
 I tell you, Polydamas; he gave it (the horse) to Troilos”
- (25) Τὴν χάριν, ὅπου ἐχάρισεν # ὁ πρίγκιπας, τὸ Ἀνάπλι  
 “The gift, which the princeps had given, namely (the city) Nauplion,”  
 κ’ εἴθ’ οὕτως τὸ Ἄργος ἐνομοῦ # τότε τὸν Μέγαν Κύρην,  
 “at that time to the Great Lord,– together with Argos –”  
 ἦτον διὰ τὴν συνδρομὴν # ὅπου ἔποικεν ἐτότε  
 “was in return for the aid which [he] had given at that moment,”  
 ὁ Μέγας Κύρης, σὲ λαλῶ, # στὸ πιάσμα τῆς Κορίνθου (CoM H 2878-2881)<sup>195</sup>  
 “the Great Lord, I say to you, in the capture of Corinth”

The same applies to the next example: the subject (the Venetians) is present in the immediate context:

- (26) καὶ πῶς πάλε τὸν ἔρριξεν # εἰς τῶν Κορφῶν τὴν νῆσον  
 “and how the galley of Venice that sailed to Crete”  
 τὸ κάτεργο τῆς Βενετίας, # ὅπου εἰς τὴν Κρήτη ἐδιάβη.  
 “had dropped him off on the island of Corfu.”  
 Στὴν Ἀνδραβίδα εὐρέθηκεν # ὁ μισὶρ Ντζεφρὲς ἐτότε•  
 “Sir Geoffrey was at that moment at Andravida”  
 κι ὡς τοῦ ἤφερε ὁ Βενέτικος # ἐκεῖνα τὰ πιττάκια,  
 “and when the Venetian brought him those letters”  
 τιμὴν μεγάλην τοῦ ἔδωκεν # κ’ ἐφιλοδώρησέ τον (2224-2227)  
 “he gave him great honour and handed over gifts”  
 (...)  
 Ἀφότου γὰρ ἐγνώρισεν # ἐκεῖνος ὁ Ρουμπέρτος  
 “When that Robert now learnt”  
 τὸν τρόπον τῆς δημηγερείας, # ὅπου τὸν ἀπεργῶσαν

<sup>195</sup> For the preverbal OCPs in these expressions in the *Chronicle of Morea*, see Soltic & Janse (2012), who relate this phrase to the transition from enclisis to proclisis; cf. *supra* 4.2.2.2.2.

“the manner of deceit, with which they misled him,”

οἱ Βενετικοί, σὲ λαλῶ, # ὥσάν σὲ τὸ ἀφηγοῦμαι,

“the Venetians, I say to you, as I tell it to you,”

ἐβιάστηκεν πολλὰ νὰ εὕρῃ # βάρκαν τοῦ νὰ ἀπερά<σ>ῃ (CoM H 2235-2238; cf. 629-630)

“he hurried to find a boat to cross over”

This is also an interesting example from another point of view, for the co-occurrence of σὲ λαλῶ with the clause ὥσάν σὲ τὸ ἀφηγοῦμαι (“as I am telling it to you”) can be considered an argument in favour of the semantic bleaching of the former expression.<sup>196</sup>

Often, the clarifying constituent contains the demonstrative pronoun ἐκεῖνος:

(27) Ὁ λαὸς δὲ τῆς Πύλαρχου # θρηνοῦσι τὸν ἀνθέντην,

“The people of Pylarchos mourned the leader,”

λέγω τὸν Προθεσέλαον, # τὸν πάμφουμον ἐκεῖνον (BT 3377-3378)

“I say, Protheselaos, that famous man”

(28) ποῦ ἐλάλησαν καὶ εἶπασιν # ὅτι ἦλθαν τὰ φουσσᾶτα

τοῦ Καλοῖωάννη, σὲ λαλῶ, # ἐκείνου τοῦ δεσπότη. (CoM H 1101-1102)

“who talked and said that the armies were coming

(the armies) of Kalojohn, I tell you, that despot”

As mentioned, demonstratives distinguish certain entities from others and thus clearly exert a clarifying role in discourse (cf. supra 5.1.3.3). It is truly revealing that, when comparing manuscript H with P, the latter sometimes inserts λέγω where the former *only* has the demonstrative pronoun:<sup>197</sup>

---

<sup>196</sup> Note that this example is of a different nature than the examples in which λέγω is *coordinated* with another verb of reporting (such as ἀφηγοῦμαι), in which case the act of speaking and thus the *conceptual* value of the verb is reinforced (cf. supra 5.3.4.1.1), for instance:

(5) Οὕτως ὥσάν σὲ τὸ λαλῶ # καὶ ὥσάν σὲ τὸ ἀφηγοῦμαι

“In this way, as I say it to you and as I tell it to you,”

ἄρχισε ἡ μάχη στὸν Μορέαν # νὰ μάχωνται οἱ δύο (CoM H 4581-4582)

“the war began in Morea, in which the two fought”

<sup>197</sup> A relative clause serves the same purpose; consider the following parallel pair:

(6) Γουργὸν σπουδαίως ἀπέστειλεν # ἐκεῖ εἰς τὸν ἀδελφόν του,

“Quickly, he hurriedly sent to his brother,”

λέγω στὸν ρῆγαν Φράτσας τε # καὶ νὰ τὸν βοηθήσῃ

“I say, to the king of France and to help him,”

φουσσᾶτα ἐκ τὸν τόπον του, # παιδευτικούς στρατιῶτες (CoM P 6826-6827)

“armies from his region, experienced soldiers”

cf. Γουργὸν σπουδαίως ἀπέστειλεν # ἐκεῖ εἰς τὸν ἀδελφόν του

(29) καὶ λέγει οὕτως πρὸς αὐτόν, # λέγω τὸν ἀδελφόν του· (CoM P 6097)  
“and he spoke thus to him, I say, his brother”

cf. καὶ λέγει οὕτως πρὸς αὐτόν # τὸν ἀδελφόν του ἐκεῖνον (CoM H 6097)  
“and he spoke thus to him, that brother of him”

(30) ὅπου ἦτον δὲ αὐτάδελφη # ἐκείνου τοῦ Δεσπότης,  
“she was the sister of that Despot,”  
τοῦ Νικηφόρου, λέγω σε, # ἀφέντου δὲ τῆς Ἄρτας. (CoM P 8064-8065)  
“Nikephoros, I tell you, lord of Arta”

(31) cf. ἐνῶ ἦτον αὐταδέλφισσα # ἐκείνου τοῦ Δεσπότης,  
“she was the sister of that Despot,”  
κὺρ Νικηφόρου ἐκείνου, # τοῦ ἀφέντη γὰρ τῆς Ἄρτας (CoM H 8064-8065)  
“that Kyr Nikephoros, the lord of Arta”

These examples undeniably demonstrate the clarification-signalling function of λέγω. Moreover, the fact that λέγω is considered an appropriate equivalent for a pronoun constitutes a strong argument for an interpretation of λέγω in terms of a DM, for it shows that the word class of λέγω is no longer relevant and that λέγω has thus to a certain extent lost its verbal value.

By now it should have become clear that the translation “I tell/say (you)” sounds very artificial and is thus far from ideal to render the procedural instances of λέγω. Although it is often difficult to translate DMs into other languages as a result of their semantic shallowness, the phrase *I mean* seems a more appropriate English candidate. Interestingly, *I mean* is also considered a(n interpersonal) DM in spoken English (Watts 1989: 208).<sup>198</sup> Forchini (2010: 326) remarks the following about *I mean*:

“‘I mean’ is basically used either to guide the listener in the interpretation of the utterance by clarifying, telling or commenting, or to allow the speaker time to find an appropriate way of expressing him/herself in order to appear less committed. In the first case (i.e. guiding the listener), ‘I mean’ is mostly used

---

“Quickly, he hurriedly sent to his brother,”  
ὅπου ἦτον ρῆγας τῆς Φραγκίας # διὰ νὰ τοῦ ἔχη βοηθήσει  
“who was king of France, in order to help him,”  
φουσσᾶτα ἀπὸ τὸν τόπον του, # παιδευτικούς στρατιῶτες (CoM H 6826-6827)  
“armies from his region, experienced soldiers”

<sup>198</sup> Cf. Chafe (1988: 14); Brinton (1996: 6); Schiffrin (1996); Tree & Schrock (1999: 280); Brinton (2007).

within a ‘clarifying function’ (...) in that it explicates, corrects, reformulates previous utterances”<sup>199</sup>

This description clearly parallels the above examples.

#### 5.3.4.1.2.2 *Attention-grabbing function*

With regard to the remaining 138 procedural examples of λέγω, it is more difficult to pinpoint their exact pragmatic function, as is the case with many DMs. By uttering λέγω, it seems that the poet wants to grab – or hold – the attention of his audience. Λέγω thus “merely” functions as a “pay attention!”-marker. Interestingly, Brinton (2008: 77) considers the task of calling or evoking the hearer’s attention one of the procedural functions of the English DM (*I*) say. This attention-grabbing function of λέγω is confirmed by its distribution, for it tends to occur after “heavy” information. Heavy information must be understood as heavy both in meaning and in form.

*Heavy in form: after expanded information*

I will begin with some examples in which λέγω is provoked by information which is heavy *in form*, namely by a long sentence or an expanded explanation, for instance:

(32) Οἱ φράγκοι ἐπωμόσασιν, # τὸν ὄρκον ἐκρατήσαν,  
ἐπῆραν τὴν Ἀνετολήν, # τὸν τόπον ἐκερδίσαν,  
εὐθέως τὸν παράδωκαν # Ἀλέξει τοῦ Βατάτζη,  
ἐνῶ ἦτον τότε βασιλεὺς # τῆς Ρωμανίας, σὲ λέγω.  
Κι ἀφότου ἐπαράλαβε # τὰ κάστροι καὶ τὰς χώρας,  
βουλὴν ἐπῆρε δολερὴν # μετὰ τοὺς ἄρχοντάς του,  
τὸ πῶς νὰ εὗρουν ἀφορμὴν # καὶ πῶς νὰ ἀπομείνουν  
ἐκ τὸ ταξεῖδι τῆς Συρίας, # καὶ νὰ μὴν κιντυνέψουν. (CoM H 58-65)

Revealingly, Lurier (1964: 68f.), who usually translates parenthetical λέγω as “I tell (you)” and “I say (to you)” without distinguishing any further semantic nuances, leaves σὲ λέγω here simply untranslated:

“The Franks, having sworn, kept their oath;  
crossing into Asia Minor, they conquered the land  
and immediately surrendered it (the land) to Alexios Vatatzes,  
who was at that time basileus of all Romania [σὲ λέγω].

---

<sup>199</sup> Cf. Schiffrin (1987: 295ff.); Brinton (2008: 111-132).



Now when he received the castles and the towns,  
 he took sly counsel with this archons  
 as to what pretext they might find and withdraw  
 from the Syrian expedition and not run any risks”

In the next 2 examples, *σὲ λέγω* is uttered in a clause which constitutes a further explanation of the previous one:

- (33) ὥς φρόνιμος νεούτσικος # μεγάλως ἔλυπήθη,  
 “he was greatly sorrowed as a prudent young man,”  
 ἔκλαψε εἰς σφόδρα, σὲ λαλῶ, # εἰς θλίψιν μεγάλην ἐμπήκεν (CoM H 1809-1810)  
 “he wept intensively, I tell you, he entered deep grief”

- (34) Οἱ Τρῶες τὸν αὐθέντην τους # κλαίουں, οὐχ ὑπομένουν•  
 “The Trojans wept over their leader, they couldn’t bear it,”  
 εἰς τὸν ναὸν Διόνυσου, # ἐκεῖ τὸν ἐφυλάξαν,  
 “in the temple of Dionysos, there they watched over him,”  
 πέντε καὶ δέκα, λέγω σας, # ἡμέρας τὸν κρατοῦσιν,  
 “five or ten, I tell you, days they held him,”  
 ὁποῦ ποτὲ οὐκ ἔπαυσεν # ὁ θρῆνος τους εἰς αὐτόν. (BT 7282-7285)  
 “their grief over him didn’t stop”

### *Heavy in meaning*

Information that is heavy *in meaning* can also trigger the use of *λέγω*. In 33 cases, *λέγω* appears after a new sentence topic (usually fulfilling the grammatical role of subject):

- (35) Ὁ Παλαμήδης, λέγω σας, # ζημίαν μεγάλην κάμνει (BT 8214)  
 “Palamedes, I tell you, caused huge damage”

Note that this example is right indented in the edition. As repeatedly mentioned, this signals that the editors intuitively feel that these verses involve a shift in discourse. The same applies to the following example, where we get a switch from the Trojans (Deïphobos and his company) to the Greeks (ἀπὸ τοὺς ἔξω, “the ones outside”):

- (36) Ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ὁ Δηΐφοβος # μετὰ τρεῖς βασιλεῖς,  
 “Then Deïphobos (followed) together with three kings,”  
 φρικτούς, μεγάλους, φοβερούς, # ἄρμα δοκιμασμένους·  
 “frightening, big, terrifying ones, experienced in arms,”  
 ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ πάλιν οἱ ἕτεροι # πλεόν ἑκατὸν χιλιάδες.  
 “then the rest (followed): more than 100,000 men.”  
 Ἀπὸ τὸν ἔξω, λέγω σας, # τίποτε οὐδὲν ἀργοῦσιν. (BT 5981-5984)  
 “From the ones outside, I tell you, no-one tarried”

Note that the topics of Deiphobos and of his company (οἱ ἕτεροι) are in their turn introduced by the adverbial DM ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ (cf. supra 5.3.3.1.6).

In the next example, our interpretation that λέγω appears after a new sentence topic is corroborated by the doubling construction (topic left-dislocation; cf. supra 5.2.3.2.2):

- (37) Καὶ ποῖος νοῦς νὰ δυνήθῃ # πάντα νὰ καταλέξῃ;  
“And what kind of soul would be able to describe everything in detail?”  
Ταῦτα τὰ περισσότερα, # λέγω, ἂν τὰ συγγράψω  
“Those rather extraordinary things, I say, if I will write them down,  
καὶ ἄρτι ἀπλῶς ἐρωτικά # θελήσω καταλέξειν  
“and I will now recount the love issues openly  
ἅπαντες ὅπου μὲ ἀκούσουσιν οἱ πάντες νὰ θλιβοῦσι (LR 4008-4011)  
“then all who will hear me, those will all suffer”

The sentence topic switch is sometimes explicitly signalled by the ancient particle δέ or by the more recently developed DM πάλιν (cf. supra 5.3.3.2):

- (38) <H> Ἀνατολὴ δέ, λέγω σας, # ἐννέα νησίᾳ ἔχει (BT 10579)<sup>200</sup>  
“Anatolia, I tell you, has nine islands”  
(39) Ἡ Ἑλένη πάλιν, λέγω σας, # ἡ τούτων ἀνταδέλφη,  
“Helen in turn, I tell you, the sister of them,”  
τὰ κάλλη τοῦ προσώπου της # τίς νὰ τὰ ἱστορήσῃ; (BT 2064-2065)  
“who could describe the beauties of her face?”

This last example proves that this attention-grabbing function of λέγω does not necessarily exclude its clarification-signalling use, for ἡ τούτων ἀνταδέλφη constitutes an apposition to ἡ Ἑλένη.

However, information which is heavy in meaning not only includes topical information. Λέγω may also involve other important and sometimes even surprising information, which is admittedly more difficult to describe in precise modern linguistic terms:

- (40) γυμνὸν ἐκράτει τὸ σπαθίν, # ὅλον καταβαμμένον  
“he held only the unsheathed sword, completely soaked”  
ἐκ τὸ αἷμα καὶ ἀπὸ τὰ πλευρά, # λέγω, τῶν Τρωαδίων (BT 3769-3770)  
“with the blood and the ribs, I say, of the Trojans”

---

<sup>200</sup> Note the editorial right indentation.

(41) πολλὰ γοργὸν νὰ ἔχασε, # λέγω σας, τὸ κεφάλιν (BT 6797)

“he would very quickly have lost, I say to you, his head”

(42) οὐ μὴ θελήσῃ σε ὁ πατήρ μου # διὰ τὴν εὐγένειάν του

“my father will not want you because of his nobility”

καὶ διὰ τὸν φόνον ὅποῦ ἔποικες, # λέγω εἰς τοὺς ἀδελφούς μου. (AB 993-994)

and because of the murder which you committed, I say, of my brothers”

(43) νὰ τὸν χωρίσω, εὐγενική, # λέγω ἐκ τὴν φουδούλα (PP 215)

“I will separate him, noble woman, I say, from the girl”

A structure which is often said to have a surprising effect is enjambment, i.e. the continuation of a clause or sentence over verse-end.<sup>201</sup> Λέγω may accompany constituents added in enjambment, as if to signal that the amount of information which is normally stored in the πολιτικὸς στίχος is contravened. Since enjambment typically involves an extended sentence, these examples are also related to the examples involving information which is heavy *in form*.<sup>202</sup>

(44) Προσέχετε ἀπὸ σᾶς τινὰς # μὴ ἐξέλθῃ τοῦ πολέμου

“Take care that no-one from you will leave the war”

δίχως ἐμένα, λέγω σας, # καὶ εὐθὺς τὸν θανατώσουν. (BT 3869-3870)

“without me, I tell you, or they will kill him immediately”

(45) Οἱ Ἕλληνες ὡς εἶδασιν # τὸν ἑαυτῶν δεσπότην

“The Greeks, when they saw their own despot [Palamedes]”

ἀποθαμένον, λέγω σας, # οἱ πλεον καλοὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦς

“dead, I tell you, the most noble of them”

πολλὰ ἐδειλιάσασιν, # ἐχάσαν τὴν ἀνδρείαν. (BT 8261-8263)

“feared a lot, they lost their courage”

In all the above examples, a translation with “I say” or “I tell” does not make much sense. It seems even more difficult to find an appropriate translation for the attention-grabbing examples than for the clarification-signalling ones (for which *I mean* could

---

<sup>201</sup> However, enjambment is a rather unusual structure in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry, in which metrical structure and syntactic structure normally correspond; cf. supra 5.1.3.1. Remember that in an IU approach, we should interpret enjambment as just another IU in a series of IUs and thus as a cognitive phenomenon; cf. supra 2.3.3.

<sup>202</sup> As a matter of fact, several clarification-signalling examples (especially those specifying a zero pronoun, e.g. BT 6216-6219, CoM H 2878-2881, CoM H 2235-2238) also involve an enjambment.

perhaps serve as an English equivalent). This may point to the fact that the former carry even less conceptual meaning.

#### 5.3.4.1.2.3 Φημί

The first person singular φημί means “I assert” or “I claim” and thus belongs to the same semantic field as λέγω. Φημί testifies to the so-called mixed idiom of the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry, for it is an ancient verb with a classicising ending and thus does certainly not belong to the contemporary spoken language (cf. supra 1.1.1.2.1). Φημί occurs only 18 times in my corpus, and the *War of Troy* accounts for all these instances. Moreover, it consistently occurs parenthetically. In the next example, φημί clearly signals a clarification, namely an accusative apposition:

- (46) Τὴν Διομήδειαν, φημί, # τούτου τὴν θυγατέραν,  
“Diomedes, I claim, his daughter,”  
<δι> ἦντινα Πολάβος γὰρ # ἔσυρε πολλὰ ἄγχη,  
“because of whom Polabos suffered many anxieties,”  
ἤφερε τὴν εὐγενικὴν, παρθένον οὖσαν, κόρην (BT 12589-12591)  
“he brought the noble one, the girl being a virgin”

In the following 2 examples, φημί occurs in a verse which elaborates the previous one and is thus found after information that is heavy in form:

- (47) Εἶθ' οὕτως ἦλθεν ὁ Οὐπὸς # καὶ Κούπεσος οἱ δύο  
“Thereupon came Houpos and Koupesos, the two,”  
μὲ τὸν λαὸν τῆς Λάρισσος # ἐσμίξασιν, ἐδῶκαν  
“with the people from Larissos, they mingled, they struggled”  
μὲ τὸν Ἀρχέλαον, φημί, # καὶ μὲ τὸν Προθενώρη  
“with Archelaos, I claim, and with Prothenor”  
καὶ πόλεμον ἐποίκασιν # ὀδυνηρὸν ἐκείνοι. (BT 3579-3582)  
“and these men waged a distressing fight”
- (48) Ἡ κόρη ἐθρήνει δυνατά, # ποτὲ οὐ παρηγορεῖται•  
“The girl mourned deeply, she was not comforted,”  
διὰ τὸν Τρώϊλον, φημί, # κλαίει, οὐχ ὑπομένει•  
“for Troïlos, I claim, she cried, she didn't bear it.”  
ἀναθυμεῖται τὴν φρικτὴν # ἀγάπην τοῦ Τρώϊλου. (BT 5807-5809)  
“she remembered the frightening love of Troïlos”

With regard to φημί too, enjambment is a frequent structure, as the following 2 examples show:

- (49) Ἡ Κουβὰ ἡ βασίλισσα # εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς ὑπάγει  
“Hekabe the queen went to the gods”

ἀτὴ της νὰ προσευχηθῇ, # νὰ ποίση τὴν θυσίαν,  
 “so that she could pray herself, do the offer,”  
 τοῦ Ἀπολλώνου δὲ φημί # μετὰ τῆς Μινερούας. (BT 11824-11826)  
 “for Apollo, I claim, together with Minerva”

- (50) Τοῦτα γὰρ ὅλα τὰ κακὰ # μᾶς ἦλθαν εἰς τὴν Τροίαν  
 “All those bad things came to us in Troy”  
 διὰ τὴν ἄρπαξιν, φημί, # τῆς κόρης τῆς Ἑλένης. (BT 11227-11228)  
 “because of the robbery, I claim, of the girl Helen”

In sum, *φημί* seems to function in a similar way as the procedural instances of *λέγω*. We will see that both expressions also exhibit a preference for the same metrical position (cf. *infra* 5.3.4.1.3).

#### 5.3.4.1.2.4 *Direct speech marker*

Finally, further research might also reveal other pragmatic functions of *λέγω* in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry. A derivation of its basic use as a message conveying verb is its ability to introduce direct speech, which constitutes a popular mode in this type of texts (cf. Anaxagorou 1998: 136; Shawcross 2009: 149). In parenthesis, direct speech is a typical feature of works intended for oral performance (Chafe 1982: 48; Vitz, Regalado & Lawrence 2005: 8 & 21f.; cf. *supra* 1.1.2.5.1.1.). Now, the verb *λέγω* does not always literally introduce direct speech: it can also “interrupt” the words of the character, in which case it typically occurs after the vocative, for instance:

- (51) πάλιν ἐλάλουν πρὸς αὐτὸν # καὶ ἐνέγκαζά τον πλέον.  
 Again I spoke to him and I urged him more.  
 «Βάσταξε, ξένε», λέγω τον, # «μὴ θλίβεσαι τοσαῦτα (LR 69-70)  
 “Hold on, stranger”, I tell him, “do not be tormented so much”
- (52) Κακὰ τὸν ἀνετίρησε, # μετὰ θυμοῦ τὸν λέγει·  
 “He looked accusingly at him, in anger he said to him,”  
 ἐκ τὸν θυμόν του ἐγίνετον # ἡ ὄψις του, ὡς εἰκάζω,  
 “because of his anger his face became, as I think,”  
 ὡς τέφρα, κόνις γέγονεν, # ὡς ἄνθος ἀκροδίων:<sup>203</sup>  
 “like ash, he became powder, like the flower of the nuts tree (?)”  
 «Ἵέ πουτάνας», λέγει τον, # «νόθε, κακὲ μπαστάρδε,  
 “‘Son of a whore’, he said to him, ‘bastard, bad bastard,’”  
 ἀποκοτίαν πῶς ἔποικες # καὶ ἦλθες ἔμπροσθέν μου; (BT 1456-1460)

<sup>203</sup> Mackridge (p.c. April 2013) suggests ἀκρόδρυα (“nuts tree”) as a conjecture.

“how have you had the audacity to come in front of me?”

- (53) Καὶ ὥς εἶδα τὴν παράξενον # τὰ δάκρυα τῆς νὰ τρέχουν,  
And when I saw the wonderful girl her tears running,  
«Σώπασε, κόρη», λέγω τὴν, # «στράταν χαρᾶς κρατοῦμεν (LR 3806-3807)  
“Be calm, girl”, I tell her, “we are taking the way of joy”

Again, these forms of λέγω (now not only 1<sup>st</sup> person singular) verbs are used parenthetically.<sup>204</sup> Interestingly, in the 3 above examples, another reporting verb which explicitly signals the beginning of the direct discourse is absent. As a consequence, these “delayed speech-introducing formulas” (Agapitos 1991: 66) signal that a change in discourse – more precisely: a transition from indirect to direct speech – has taken place. González (2005: 69) considers such direct speech markers a subtype of DMs: “Direct speech initiator (...): by means of this marker the speaker introduces quoted material, i.e. direct speech. It can be found either inside or outside of the quotation”. In this context, it is interesting to invoke the comparison made by modern linguists between DMs and editorial punctuation: λέγω here seems to have the capacity of modern quotation marks (cf. supra 2.5.3.4).

#### 5.3.4.1.3 Metre

It attracts attention that the procedural examples of λέγω, all parenthetically used, tend to “circle around” the boundaries of the πολιτικὸς στίχος, i.e. the verse-end and especially the fixed caesura, with regard to which we have extensively argued that they can both be equated with an IU boundary (cf. supra 5.1). We should thus compare the position of the procedural examples with the position of the conceptual examples in order to i) examine whether this impression is confirmed by frequency counts and ii) prove that the single reason for this distribution is not *metri causa*, for one may object that we should simply attribute this positional preference to the metrical value of the forms.

---

<sup>204</sup> A comparison with the Latin reporting verb *inquit* (“he says”) might be relevant. This verb tends to occur between two IUs: “la position de *inquit* (...) montre la validité de la notion de segmentation: la principale et la subordonnée constituent deux segments séparés par *inquit*” (Janse 1994a: 114).

Table 16 Metrical position of procedural (parenthetical) λέγω

Total: 207		
IU-initial: 50 (24%) X ... # X ....	Verse-initial X ... # ...	8 (4%)
	Postcaesural ... # X ...	42 (20%)
IU-final: 142 (69%) ... X # ... X	Precaesural ... X # ...	116 (56%)
	Verse-final ... # ... X	26 (13%)
IU-interrupting: 15 (7%) ... X .... # ... X ...	Inside first half-verse ... X ... # ...	15 (7%)
	Inside second half-verse ... # ... X ...	0 (0%)

Table 17 Metrical position of conceptual λέγω

Total: 320		
IU-initial: 94 (29%) X ... # X ....	Verse-initial (possibly preceded by a monosyllable, such as καί and νά) X ... # ...	55 (17%)
	Postcaesural (possibly preceded by monosyllable) ... # X ...	39 (12%)
IU-final: 131 (41%) ... X # ... X	Precaesural ... X # ...	41 (13%)
	Verse-final ... # ... X	90 (28%)
IU-interrupting: 95 (30%) ... X .... # ... X ...	Inside first half-verse ... X ... # ...	83 (26%)
	Inside second half-verse ... # ... X ...	12 (4%)

The figures are telling: they confirm that there is a striking tendency for the procedural forms to appear next to either the verse-end (17%)<sup>205</sup> or – preferably – the caesura (76%).<sup>206</sup> In no less than 56% of the procedural cases, λέγω occurs immediately before the caesura, so we can conclude that the procedural instances show a distinct preference for precaesural position. Contrary to the conceptual examples, the procedural instances of λέγω do not easily occur inside the half-verse (30% IU-interrupting conceptual instances versus only 7% IU-interrupting procedural ones). The preference for precaesural position is even more distinct in the case of φημί, which is consistently used parenthetically in the *War of Troy*. With the exception of one example, this verb always appears immediately before the caesura (cf. supra 5.3.4.1.2.3):<sup>207</sup>

(54) διὰ τὸν πόλεμον, φημί, # τὸν ἔστησαν οἱ δύο. (BT 5646)  
 “because of the war, I say, which the two started”

As a matter of fact, it is logical that the form is not found in *postcaesural* position, given the enclitic nature of the verb in Ancient Greek.

Below, I will tentatively link these observations to the modern linguistic concept of filled pauses (cf. infra 5.3.4.3). First, however, I will discuss a second (type of) verbal DM which I have identified in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry.

### 5.3.4.2 Γνώριζε

#### 5.3.4.2.1 Semantics & syntax

This section starts from the observation that the second person singular imperative “know!” truly abounds in the *War of Troy*, our longest (preserved) text (cf. supra 3.3.1.1). Together, the epistemic imperative forms (ἐ)γνώριζε/σε, ἤξευρε and πρόσεχε occur no fewer than 140 times – or almost once every hundred verses.<sup>208</sup> The remaining seven texts of my corpus account for only 56 instances of these imperative forms, of which we

<sup>205</sup> Verse-initial + verse-final = 4% + 13%.

<sup>206</sup> Postcaesural + precaesural = 20% + 56%.

<sup>207</sup> The sole exception is BT 11989, in which the parenthetical verb is inserted in the first half-verse:

(7) καὶ ὁ Δυσσεύς, φημί, ἐλάλησεν, # ὁ σύντροφος ἐκείνου. (BT 11989)  
 “and Odysseus, I claim, spoke, his companion”

Note that the odd third syllable bears a stress and that the rhythm of this verse seems in general distorted, which may point to a corrupted verse. However, the functioning of φημί is clear: it signals a clarification towards the listener (cf. apposition in the nominative with the demonstrative pronoun ἐκεῖνος).

<sup>208</sup> From now on, I use γνώριζε as the covering term.



will see that only 8 forms will function as DMs, while the *War of Troy* contains 106 procedural examples. Therefore, I will focus on the *War of Troy*, without, however, ignoring the examples from the other texts from my corpus.

Table 18 Frequency of the singular imperative of verbs of knowing

	BT: 140	Other seven texts: 56	Total: 196
γνώριζε	24	8	32
ἐγνώριζε	41	9	50
γνώρισε	2	11	13
ἤξευρε	65	15	80
πρόσεχε	8	13	21

As is the case with λέγω, it does not seem appropriate to take all these verbal forms literally: in many cases in the *War of Troy* γνώριζε has “lost” its strong peremptory tone and a rendering by the imperious “know!” or “you should know that!” then hardly makes sense. Although these forms are still imperatives from a morphological perspective, they actually function as DMs, which explains their high frequency in the *War of Troy*.

However, let me begin by outlining how we can recognise the purely conceptual examples. If the form in question possesses an argument, we can again derive that the element under scrutiny is without doubt a verbal and thus genuinely imperative form, by which I mean it has the value of a real command (cf. supra 2.5.2.2). Biraud (2010: 26) makes the same remark with regard to the Ancient Greek imperatival DMs: “la pleine valeur verbale liée au signifié d’impératif est évidente lorsque ἄγε, φέρε ou ἴθι ont des compléments”.<sup>209</sup> Once again, the same applies to adverbs (or adverbially used prepositional phrases). As for the *War of Troy*, of the 140 singular imperatives of a verb of knowing, 20 have arguments/adverbs. In the first example, a simple constituent (ἀπὸ ἐμέναν) functions as the argument of the imperative, while we have a completive clause in the second (ὅτι) and an indirect question in the third one (πῶς):

- (1) Εὐκαιρα <νὰ> ἐκοπίασες, # ἐγνώριζε ἀπὸ ἐμέναν•  
 “Your efforts would be in vain, accept that from me,”  
 οἱ θεοὶ γὰρ ἐβάλασιν # ὅλην τὴν φύλαξίν τους (BT 353-534)  
 “for the gods have installed maximum protection”

<sup>209</sup> Cf. Zakowski (2014) for Ancient Greek εἰπέ.

- (2) Ἦξευρε ὅτι Ἑκτορας, # ἐὰν σμίξῃ μὲ τοὺς ἔξω,  
 “Realise that Hektor, if he mixes up with those from outside,”  
 ἐχάσας τον, οὐδέποτε # στρέφεται νὰ τὸν ἴδῃς (BT 6691-6692)  
 “you’ll have lost him, he’ll never return so that you can see him (again)”
- (3) «Πρόσεχε πῶς νὰ πολεμῇς, # πῶς εἰς αὐτοὺς νὰ ἐμπαίνῃς (BT 3252)  
 “Pay attention to how you will wage war, how you will approach them”

With regard to the other seven texts of my corpus, 29 of the 56 imperatives contain an argument/adverb. In the next example, the argument takes the form of a relative clause:

- (4) Ἄρτι ἰδέ την τὴν γραφὴν # καὶ γνώριξε τὸ πάσχω (LR 1155)<sup>210</sup>  
 “Now, watch it, the letter and know what I suffer”

The presence of such modifiers clearly excludes an interpretation in terms of a DM. In other words: imperatives with DM characteristics always lack arguments/adverbs. However, the opposite is not necessarily true: a form without arguments/adverbs is not always semantically bleached. As a matter of fact, of the 120 examples which lack arguments/adverbs in the *War of Troy*, 7 can be excluded from a DM interpretation on the basis of their position. These imperatives all open direct speech and communicate a command to the addressee. As such, they clearly belong to the conceptual end of the scale, for instance:

- (5) Ἐκεῖνοι ἀπεκρίθησαν: # «Γνώριξε, στρατιῶτα,  
 “They answered: “Know, soldier,”  
 ἡμεῖς ποτὲ τὸν Πρίαμον # οὐκ οἶδαμεν τίς ἔστι (BT 1428-1429)  
 “we do not know who Priam is”

As this example reveals, vocatives also constitute a strong sign of genuine imperatives: you give someone an order and then address him/her. The vocatives can of course also precede the imperative:

- (6) «Κυρία μου, ἐγνώριξε, # χαρὰν τυχαίνει νὰ ἔχῃ  
 “My lady, realise, he will have joy,”  
 ἐκεῖνος ὅπου σὲ ἠγάπῃ # ἢ ποτὲ ἠγάπησέ σε. (BT 5811-5812)  
 “he who loves you or has once loved you.”

<sup>210</sup> The first half-verse contains an instance of backgrounding; cf. supra 5.2.3.2.3.

- (7) «Στρατιῶτα», λέγει, # «πρόσεχε, κακὸν μὴ τὸ κρατήσης  
 “Soldier”, she says, “pay attention, don’t take it the wrong way”  
 διατὶ θέλω ὅτι ἐγνώριμη # νὰ γένωμαι εἰς ἐσένα. (BT 333-334)  
 “because I want to become known by you”
- (8) «Αὐθέντη», λέγει, «ἐγνώριζε, # θέλω νὰ σὲ ἔχω δείξει  
 “Master”, she says, “know, I will want to show you  
 τὸ μέγα θαῦμα ὅπου πονῶ, # ὅπου εἶδα αὐτὴν τὴν νύκτα (BT 6581-6582)  
 “the great wonder which I suffer, which I saw this night”
- (9) «Θυγάτηρ μου, ἐγνώριζε, # τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ μέλλον (BT 5917)  
 “My daughter, know, this is fate”

Note that the above examples can be easily rephrased by a completive clause introduced by the subordinator “that” in English, so that the imperative form actually does have an argument (direct object) (cf. supra 2.5.2.2). For instance, the last example can be reformulated as: “My daughter, know *that* this is fate”.

As for the other seven texts of my corpus, 9 of the 27 examples without arguments/adverbs can also be considered genuine imperatives for the same reason; I give 2 such examples of γνώριζε opening direct speech:

- (10) Κ’ ἐκεῖνοι ὡς ᾗσαν λυπηροὶ # μετὰ δακρύων τοῦ λέγουν•  
 Lurier (1964: 122): “And mournfully with tears in their eyes they said to him”  
 “Ἀφέντη μας, ἐγνώριζε, # ἀπέθανε ὁ ἀδελφός σου (CoM H 1797-1798)  
 “Know, our lord, your brother has died”
- (11) εἶπα τον: «Ξένε, γνώριζε, # λέγει ὁ μύθος οὕτως (LR 86)  
 “I told him: “Stranger, know, the saying goes as follows”

Indeed, position is again a crucial means to distinguish the conceptual instances of γνώριζε from the procedural ones. Again, we will see that the latter are consistently found in parenthetical position, whereas this does not hold for the “normal” conceptual examples. As is the case for the parenthetical examples of λέγω, the parenthetical forms of γνώριζε can be identified by the fact that their person and number (2<sup>nd</sup> person singular vs. narrative 3<sup>rd</sup> person) differs from the surrounding verbs. Moreover, their mood too is different (imperative vs. indicative/subjunctive). Once more, coordination too constitutes an appropriate criterion for singling out conceptual examples, as Biraud (2010: 27) has already noted with regard to the above mentioned Ancient Greek imperatival DMs: “la coordination est aussi un bon critère de. L’interprétation comme impératif s’impose lorsque ἄγε, ἴθι ou φέρε sont coordonnés à un autre verbe à l’impératif”. Therefore, 7 more of the examples without arguments/adverbs in the War

of Troy and 10 more in the other seven texts can also be eliminated as potential DMs, for instance:

- (12) *μη ὀργισθῆς τὸ σφάλμα μου, # μη τόσον μὲ κακίσης*<sup>211</sup>  
“do not be angry at my mistake, do not hurt me so much,  
*γνώρισε*, ἦμουν χωρικός, # καὶ συγγνωμόνησέ με•  
“know, I was a peasant, and forgive me”  
*ἀρκοῦσιν τὰ μὲ ἐπαίδευσες # καὶ νῦν ἐλέησέ με* (LR 441-443)  
“the things you taught me are sufficient and have now mercy upon me”

Here as well, the coordination should by no means be explicitly expressed by καί (cf. supra 5.3.4.1.1):

- (13) *Λοιπόν, νίέ μου, ἐγνώριζε, # μάθε το: ἐπουλήθην* (PP 1130)  
“Now, my son, know, learn it, I sold [her]”  
  
(14) *συμπόνει τοὺς ἐπίκρανεν # ἡ ἀγάπη ἀπὸ θυμοῦ της*  
“Have pity on those whom the love through her desire embittered”  
*γνώρισε*, ἰδὲ καὶ τὰς γραφάς, # μάθε διὰ τίναν ἔναι (LR 1372-1373)  
“know, see the letters, learn because of whom it is”

In the following passage, Medea is advising Jason how to get hold of the Golden Fleece. In a context of giving advice, it is typical for imperatives to occur, in particular for those of knowing. Furthermore, the act of knowing is clearly emphasised (θέλω νὰ τὸ ἠξεύρης) in this example, which confirms its conceptual interpretation:

- (15) *καὶ ταῦτα δράμε, σπούδαζε, # νὰ φθάσης εἰς τὸν ὄφιν.*  
“and run those [4 stadia], hurry, so that you reach the serpent.”  
*Πόλεμον μέγαν, γνώριζε, # μετ’ αὐτόν θέλεις ποίσει.*  
“A big fight, know, you will have with it.”  
*Ἀλλὰ τίποτε, ἤξευρε, # δύναμιν πρὸς ἐσέναν*  
“But know, power over you”  
*οὐκ ἔχει ὁ ὄφιν, ἤξευρε, # πληροφορήθητί το.*  
“the serpent doesn’t have, be aware of that.”  
*Πάλιν δὲ τοῦτο ἐγνώριζε, # καὶ θέλω νὰ τὸ ἠξεύρης•*  
“Know also this, and I want you to be conscious of it:  
*τὰ δόντια του ὅλα ἐξέβαλε # καὶ εἰς τὴν γῆν τὰ σπεῖρε* (BT 569-574)  
pull out all his teeth and sow them in the earth”

---

<sup>211</sup> The negation μή + aorist subjunctive is used to express a prohibition and thus has the same value as the (negative) imperative.

As a matter of fact, not only in the last example, but in all the above examples, the imperatives occur in direct speech of characters. Moreover, this character text typically involves passages in which characters address each other (cf. vocatives, a series of imperatives), which strengthens our interpretation of these imperational forms in terms of genuine commands. We will see that the DM-like examples, to which I will now proceed, do not appear in such an interactive environment.

### 5.3.4.2.2 Pragmatics

In the *War of Troy* we count 106 DM-like examples of γνώριζε, while the rest of my corpus accounts for only 8 instances.<sup>212</sup> As mentioned, procedural γνώριζε is consistently used parenthetically, just like procedural λέγω:

(16) ὅλοι ἀγρυπνοῦν, ἐγνώριζε, # τινὰς οὐδὲν κοιμᾶται. (BT 12785)

“all are awake, know, no-one sleeps.”

(17) Μετὰ χαρᾶς, ἐγνώριζε, # θέλει νὰ τὴν ἐπάρῃ• (BT 1372)

“With joy, know, he will take her”

(18) Ἐμπρὸς παρὰ νὰ πληρωθῇ # ὁ πόλεμος ἐτοῦτος,

“Rather than that this war will come to an end,”

εἰς θάνατο ὅλοι, γνώριζε, # θέλομεν καταντήσει. (BT 4187-4188)

“in death we all, know, will end up.”

(19) Νὰ τοὺς μηνύσω, ἐγνώριζε, # τὴν αὔριον ἐσπέραν (BT 11313)

“I will inform them, know, tomorrow evening”

(20) νὰ ὑπᾶμε εἰς τὴν πατρίδαν μου # καὶ εἰς τὰ γονικά μου.

“let us go to my mother country and to my parents.

Τὰ γονικά μου ἤξευρε # ἔναι εἰς τὴν Προβέντζαν.

My parents, know, are in the Provence.

Ρήγας ἔναι ὁ πατέρας μου, # αὐθέντης τῆς Προβέντζας (IM 494-496)

“My father is a king, leader of the Provence”

(21) Εἰς τὴν Ζήλικον ἦλθαμεν, # κακὰ μᾶς ἀππλικεῦσε

“We reached Zelikos, it treated us badly,”

τὸ μελλόμενον, ἤξευρε, # τῆς ἀσυστάτου Τύχης. (BT 13625-13626)

“the future, know, of unstable Fate”

<sup>212</sup> The precise numbers are: *War of Troy*: 58 ἤξευρε; 17 γνώριζε; 29 ἐγνώριζε; 2 γνώρισε; other seven texts: 6 ἤξευρε; 2 γνώριζε.

(22) Ἦσαν οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ μετ' αὐτὸν # ἔξωθεν τοῦ Ἑκτόρου,  
 “His sons were with him, except for Hektor,”  
 ὁποῦ ἦτον ἔξω ἀπόμακρα, # ἐσύνασε τὰς χρεῖας  
 “who was far away abroad, he was collecting the needs”  
 τὰς εἶχε ἡ πόλις, γνῶριζε, # διὰ ζωοτροφίαν. (BT 1320-1322)  
 “which the city had, know, concerning nourishment”

(23) Ἡύρηκα πάλιν, ἤξευρε, # πιττάκιν ἄλλον ἕνα (LR 1535)  
 “I found again, know, one other letter”

All the above examples are also taken from character text. Interestingly, however, procedural γνῶριζε can also occur in narrator text, unlike conceptual γνῶριξε. Now, while direct speech of characters can contain both interactive and narrative passages, the text of the storyteller is basically purely narrative.<sup>213</sup> No fewer than 46 of the 106 DM-like examples in the *War of Troy* appear in narrator text.<sup>214</sup> This corroborates their procedural interpretation, for real commands naturally occur in an interactive context rather than in a mere descriptive one. In the following passage, for instance, we find an ἔκφρασις of a garment which the girl Briseïs is wearing:

(24) Ἔσωθεν ἦτον, ἤξευρε, # μὲ γοῦναν ἐνδυμένον,  
 “Inside it [the garment] was, know, lined with fur,”  
 οἷαν ὁ κόσμος πούπετε # οὐκ εἶδε νὰ φορέσῃ (BT 5723-5724)  
 “of a kind which the world has never seen someone wearing”

The following verses too seem purely narrative:

(25) Οὕτως τὸ εἶπαν, ἤξευρε, # Ναυπλίου τοῦ πατρός του. (BT 13279)  
 “So they said it, know, to Nauplios, his father”

(26) Εἶχεν ἡ πόρτα ἡ κάθε μία # φύλαξιν, ὡς ἀνέγνων,  
 “Each door had one guard, as I read,”  
 πλεον τῶν χιλίων, ἐγνῶριζε, # καλῶν καβαλλαρίων. (BT 1298-1299)  
 “of more than 10.000, know, decent horsemen”

(27) ὁ Ἀγαμέμνων ὀπισθεν # μὲ τριάκοντα χιλιάδες  
 “Agamemnon (was) behind with 30,000”  
 ὁποῦ τὸν κάμπον, ἤξευρε, # πλεον οὐδὲν τὸν ἀφήνουν. (BT 10312-10313)  
 “who from now on, know, do not leave the field”

<sup>213</sup> Metanarrative statements are a subpart of the narrator text.

<sup>214</sup> As for the other seven texts, all 8 procedural instances are found in character text.

(28) Ὁ Αἴας πάλιν, ἤξευρε, # τόσα ἦτον χολιασμένος,  
 “Ajax, in his turn, know, was so furious,”  
 ὅτι δι’ ὀλίγον ἔχανε # τὸν νοῦν του ἐκ τὴν μανίαν (BT 12772-12773)  
 “that he almost lost his mind in his frenzy”

(29) Κάσσανδρος <οὔν> ὁ ἀδελφὸς # ἐκείνης τῆς Αἰγιάλης  
 “Kassandros, the brother of that girl Aigiali”  
 ὥσάν στρατιώτης ἔκαμε, # καθὼς τὸ λέγει ὁ λόγος•  
 “behaved as a soldier, as the story tells it:”  
 <ἐξ> ὅλων πῆρε τὴν ἀξίαν, # ἤξευρε, τοῦ πολέμου. (BT 13366-13368)  
 “he took from all the dignity, know, of the war”

As these examples already show, it is much more difficult to describe the precise pragmatic role of γνώριζε than that of λέγω, which has an eye-catching clarification-signalling function (cf. supra 5.3.4.1.2.1). The least that we can say is that DM-like γνώριζε should also be situated on the interpersonal rather than on the purely textual level: it involves the listener, as reflected by the second person singular verbal morphology. It might be relevant to note that I have found 2 examples in which ἤξευρε interrupts a clitic doubling construction (twice topic left-dislocation) and thus follows a new sentence topic (cf. supra 5.3.4.1.2.2):

(30) Τὸ θέλημά σου, ἤξευρε, # ποτέ μου οὐ μὴ τὸ στρέξω (LR 3107)  
 “Your will, know, I will never accept it”

(31) Τὴν ΠλάτZIA Φλώρε ἤξευρε # ἐσὲν τὴν παραδίδω  
 “Platzia Phlora, know, I give her to you,”  
 νὰ τὴν φυλάττης ὡς ἐμέ, καλῶς νὰ τὴν προσέχης”. (PP 267-268)  
 “in order to guard her like me, in order to treat her well”

A final argument in favour of a DM-like interpretation is the fossilisation of γνώριζε, which is a typical step in the process of grammaticalisation (cf. supra 2.5.1.4). I have noticed that the singular forms are sometimes used when addressing a more than one person, while the plural forms (ἐ)γνωρίζετε, προσέχετε and ἡξεύρετε do exist and do occur in my corpus. As mentioned above, the parenthetical DM-like forms are used both in character text and in narrator text. In the former type of text, I have found 15 examples of a parenthetical singular imperative used to address a *plural* public in the

*War of Troy*.<sup>215</sup> I give 2 representative examples, in which I put the elements (vocatives, verbal forms, pronouns) which refer to the second person plural [pl] in *italics*:

- (32) «Ἄρχοντες», λέγει, «ἐδὰ καλὰ # ὑπαγαίνει τὸ πρᾶγμα.  
 “Leaders”, he says, “now the business is going well.”  
 Ἐδὰ θέλω νὰ κάμετε # τοῦτο τὸ θέλω εἶπει.  
 “Now I will want you [pl] to do what I’ll say.”  
 Ἄς ὑπάγουν μεσάζιοι εἰς τὸν Λυκομηδίαν  
 “Messengers should go to Lykomedia”  
 τὸν βασιλέα τὸν φρόνιμον, πατέρα Δηϊδάμας.  
 “to the wise king, father of Deïdama.”  
 Ἐκεῖνος κάμνει ἀνατροφὴν ἀπὸ ἓναν παλληκάριν,  
 “He takes care of the education of a youth,”  
 υἱὸν τῆς θυγατέρας του, σπέρμα τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως.  
 “a son of his daughter, seed of Achilles.”  
 Ὡς δεκαπέντε ἡμπορεῖ χρόνους νὰ ἔχῃ ἐκεῖνος•  
 “He must be approximately 15 years old,”  
 διὰ καβαλλάρην, ἤξευρε, # ἔνι πολλὰ μέγας.  
 “in horse-riding, know, he is very great.”  
 Ὅμοιος, καθόμοιος, λέγω σας, # εἰς πρόσοψιν, εἰς κάλλος  
 “An equal, a peer, I tell you [pl], in face, in beauty”  
 εἰς συντυχία, εἰς διακίνημαν, εἰς φρόνησιν, εἰς τάξιν  
 “in conversation, in movement, in wisdom, in attitude”  
 τίποτε οὐκ ἀφαλίζει τον, ὅλος ἔν’ τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως. (BT 10270-10280)  
 “nothing makes him lose his strength, he is completely like Achilles.”

- (33) «Ἄρχοντες», λέγει, «ἄσχημον # βουλήν, μοχθηροτάτην,  
 “Leaders”, she says, “a horrid decision, a malicious one,”  
 ἐπήρετε διὰ θάνατον # νὰ μὲ ἔχετε φονεύσει·  
 “you [pl] took concerning the death to which you [pl] will condemn me,”  
 ἐκδίκησις οὐκ ἔγινε εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα κόσμον  
 “revenge hasn’t happened in the whole world”  
 τόσα κακίστη, λέγω σας, # καὶ νὰ τὴν ἀφηγοῦνται.  
 “(which is) so evil, I tell you [pl], and they will proclaim it.”

<sup>215</sup> As for the other seven texts, no such instance has been found.

Narrator text cannot be used for this purpose, since the poet sometimes addresses his (real or fictitious) audience as a singular and sometimes as a plural; compare for instance:

- (8) Ἄκουσον τὰ ὀνόματα # υἱῶν καὶ θυγατέρων. (BT 1190)  
 “Hear [sg] the names of the sons and daughters”  
 (9) ἔμπροσθεν νὰ ἀκούσετε # τὰ ἀνδραγαθήματά του. (BT 1194)  
 “below you [pl] will hear his miraculous deeds”



Ὅλοι μεγάλοι βασιλεῖς εἶσθε, # μεγάλοι ἄνθρωποι,  
 “You are all great kings, great men,”  
 καὶ εἶπατε θάνατον ἐμοί, # τὸν σ<τ>υγητὸν ἐτοῦτον;  
 “but you [pl] sentenced me to death, that hateful thing?”  
 Θανάτου κίνδυνον ποτὲ οὐκ ἐξεδούλευσά τον  
 “The danger of the death, I’ve never ministered to it,”  
 τίποτε οὐκ ἔκαμα ποτὲ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ζωῆς μου,  
 “I’ve never done anything in the days of my life,”  
 διὰ νὰ μὲ δώσουν θάνατον ἢ ὄχλησιν καμμίαν.  
 “to give people reason to give me death or another distress.”  
 Τόσα εἶμαι ἀπὸ εὐστόλιστον, εὐγενικὴν γενέαν,  
 “I am from a decent, aristocratic lineage”  
 κόρη παρθένος, ἀγαθή, δίχωτα πονηρίας  
 “a virgin girl, a noble one, without wickedness”  
 ἂν σᾶς ἐφάνη, ἐλάχαινε # νὰ ἔλειψε ἀπ’ ἐμένα.  
 “if it seemed good to you [pl], it would happen that this (sentence) passes from me.”  
 Τὸν Πρίαμον τὸν βασιλέα # ἐσφάζετε ἀδίκως,  
 “You [pl] slaughtered king Priam in an unjust way,”  
 υἱοὺς καὶ ἀνεψίους του, συγγενεῖς ἐδικοὺς του.  
 “his sons and nephews, his own relatives.”  
 Τόσους ἐκατεκόψετε, # ἐσφάζετε διάπαξ,  
 “You [pl] killed so many, you caused such a complete bloodbath”  
 ὅτι ἓνα μῆνα ἀργήσετε # διὰ νὰ καθαρισθῆτε  
 “that it took you [pl] a one month to clean yourselves”  
 ἀπὸ τὸ αἷμα τὸ πολὺ # τὸ ἐχύσετε ὥσει ὕδωρ.  
 “of the much blood you [pl] had poured like water.”  
 Καὶ ἀκόμη οὐκ ἐκορέσθητε # ἀπὸ τοὺς τόσους φόνους,  
 “And still you [pl] are not satiated by the many murders,”  
 ἀλλ’ <ἐκ> τὸν ἐμὸν θάνατον # θέλετε κορεσθῆναι;  
 “but will you [pl] become satiated by my death?”  
 <Διὰ> τοῦτο <οὐ> θέλω, ἐγνώριξε, # χωρὶς ἀντιλογίας  
 “I don’t want, know, without objection”  
 νὰ ζήσω πλέον ἐξόπισθεν # εἰς τέτοιαν πονοθλίψιν (BT 12422-12442)  
 “to live any more behind such painful grief”

This phenomenon again points to the fact that the original conceptual value of these forms has been weakened.

#### 5.3.4.2.3 Metre

Fascinatingly, we again observe that the procedural parenthetical forms have a marked preference for a specific metrical position and that this is once more the position around the caesura, in particular the pre-caesural position (cf. φημί supra 5.3.4.1.2.3). Of the 106 DM-like instances in the *War of Troy*, no fewer than 99 forms occupy the

precaesural position, while 6 take the position immediately after the caesura and one sole form is found *inside* the half-verse.<sup>216</sup> The 8 procedural instances in the other seven texts are even without exception found immediately before the caesura.

One may raise the objection that we should simply attribute this fact to the metrical value of the forms. Partly, this is of course true: all forms (γνώριζε, ἐγνώριζε, γνώρισε, ἤξευρε and πρόσεχε) have the metrical pattern “(no stress +) stress + no stress + no stress” and thus nicely fit in the end of the first half-verse of the πολιτικὸς στίχος (syllabic positions 6-7-8). Nevertheless, this metrical pattern is by no means confined to this position. Theoretically, the pattern “stress + no stress + no stress” can appear in the following syllabic positions: 1-2-3, 4-5-6<sup>217</sup>, 6-7-8 and 9-10-11,<sup>218</sup> as has been proven by the non-parenthetical forms above. The fact that the genuine imperatives have a wider distribution pattern suggests that the inclination of the parenthetical DM-like imperatives towards precaesural position cannot be completely explained by metrical constraints. As a matter of fact, the 34 conceptual examples in the *War of Troy* are distributed as follows: 7 verse-initial; 21 precaesural; 4 postcaesural; 1 verse-final and 1 inside the half-verse. Thus, 26% (9/34) of the conceptual examples are *not* found in a position circling around the caesura, while this is not even 1% (1/106) in the case of the procedural ones. A similar picture emerges with regard to the 48 conceptual imperatives in the other seven texts: 22 verse-initial; 17 precaesural; 7 postcaesural and 2 verse-final. This means that half (24/48) of the conceptual examples do *not* circle around the caesura!

Moreover, the form ἤξευρε can also function as an *indicative* rather than as an imperative, which happens 43 times in the *War of Troy* and 3 times in the rest of my corpus. When having this mood, ἤξευρε cannot be said to have a marked preference for a certain metrical position, although it of course shows the same metrical pattern: 6 verse-initial; 15 precaesural; 7 postcaesural; 2 verse-final and 16 (including the 3

---

<sup>216</sup> This exception is BT 5766:

(10) ἐκεῖνον, γνώριζε, ἀγαπᾷ, # τὰ δ' ἄλλα πάντα ἀφίηκει. (BT 5766)  
 “him, know, she loves, and she forgets all the other things.”

<sup>217</sup> As is, for instance, the case with the exception which appears inside the half-verse:

ἐκεῖνον, γνώριζε, ἀγαπᾷ, # (BT 5766)

<sup>218</sup> The syllabic positions 2-3-4 and 10-11-12 would in principle also be possible, yet it is unlikely that one-syllable word will precede the imperative to occupy respectively syllable 1 and 9.

examples from the other seven texts) inside the half-verse. I give an example of each position:<sup>219</sup>

(34) Ἦξευρε γὰρ τὸν θάνατον # τῶν ἀδελφῶν τῶν δύο (BT 14295)

“She was aware of the death of the two brothers”

(35) πολλὰς μαντείας ἤξευρε # καὶ τὰς ἑπτὰ τῶν τέχνων (BT 1670)

“he knew many prophecies as well as the seven skills”

(36) Τουγκλὰς πεντεκαίδεκατος, # ἤξευρε τὸ ζατρίκιν (BT 3308)

“the fifteenth [bastard son] was Tougklas, he knew the game of chess”

(37) καλὰ ἤξευρε τὸ θάρρος του # ποῦ καὶ εἰς τίναν τὸ ἔχει (BT 5655)

“he knew very well in whom he had faith”

(38) Ποτὲ ὁ Δαυῖδ πλεώτερα # οὐκ ἤξευρε νὰ κρούῃ (BT 6337)

“David was no longer able to give hard knocks”

The same applies to the *indicative* ἐγνώρισε, which has exactly the same metrical value as ἐγνώριζε: of the 11 times ἐγνώρισε occurs in the *War of Troy*, it opens the verse 3 times, it occurs 3 times immediately before the caesura, it is found 4 times immediately after the caesura and it appears once inside the half-verse. The 6 instances of the indicative ἐγνώρισε in the other seven texts of my corpus show the same varied distributional pattern: there are 3 verse-initial and 2 postcaesural examples and only one precaesural example. These statistics are summarised in the following tables:

---

<sup>219</sup> Furthermore, the poet sometimes seems allowed to change the accent in this kind of poetry, in order to fit a word into the metre (cf. Pappas 2004: 78f.; cf. supra 4.2.3.5). As such, the indicative form ἤξευρε (instead of ἤξευρε) is found twice in verse-final position, for instance:

(11) Τῶν ἀρμάτων τὸ κάμωμα # τινὰς οὐδὲν ἤξευρε (BT 3648; cf. 13677).

“No one recognised the military equipment”

Table 19 Metrical position of procedural (parenthetical) γνώριζε

Total: 114		
IU-initial: 6 (5.2%) X ... # X ....	Verse-initial X ... # ...	0 (0%)
	Postcaesural ... # X ...	6 (5.2%)
IU-final: 107 (94%) ... X # ... X	Precaesural ... X # ...	107 (94%)
	Verse-final ... # ... X	0 (0%)
IU-interrupting: 1 (0.8%) ... X .... # ... X ...	Inside first half-verse ... X ... # ...	1 (0.8%)
	Inside second half-verse ... # ... X ...	0 (0%)

Table 20 Metrical position of conceptual γνώριζε

Total: 82		
IU-initial: 40 (49%) X ... # X ....	Verse-initial (possibly preceded by a monosyllable, such as καί and vá) X ... # ...	29 (35%)
	Postcaesural (possibly preceded by monosyllable) ... # X ...	11 (14%)
IU-final: 41 (50%) ... X # ... X	Precaesural ... X # ...	38 (46%)
	Verse-final ... # ... X	3 (4%)
IU-interrupting: 1 (0.1%) ... X .... # ... X ...	Inside first half-verse ... X ... # ...	1 (0.1%)
	Inside second half-verse ... # ... X ...	0 (0%)

Table 21 Metrical position of indicatives ἤξευρε and ἐγνώρισε

Total: 63		
IU-initial: 25 (40%) X ... # X ....	Verse-initial X ... # ...	12 (19%)
	Postcaesural ... # X ...	13 (21%)
IU-final: 21 (33%) ... X # ... X	Precaesural ... X # ...	19 (30%)
	Verse-final ... # ... X	2 (3%)
IU-interrupting: 17 (27%) ... X ... # ... X ...	Inside first half-verse ... X ... # ...	11 (17.5%)
	Inside second half-verse ... # ... X ...	6 (9.5%)

These statistics clearly demonstrate that the DM-like examples differ from the other forms in position preference: the procedural instances have a strong inclination towards precaesural position, whereas the conceptual imperatives as well as the indicatives ἤξευρε and ἐγνώρισε (which have the same metrical pattern) show a more random distribution. By way of conclusion, I will tentatively relate this observation to another modern linguistic concept, namely the phenomenon of filled pauses.

### 5.3.4.3 Filled pauses?

If we now total the procedural instances of γνῶριζε and λέγω which circle around the caesura, the results are striking: of the 321 DM-like instances of both γνῶριζε and λέγω, 271 are found either immediately before (223) or immediately after the caesura (48), which corresponds to 84% of the total! Furthermore, if we also involve φημί, which is found without exception in precaesural position, the results are even more overwhelming. In other words, we can assert that our parenthetical verbal DMs prefer to occur *next to a breathing pause*, on the assumption that we can equate the fixed caesura with an IU boundary (cf. supra 5.1). However, one can imagine that the IU boundary formed by the caesura is not as strong as the one formed by the verse-end. Therefore, we could tentatively suggest that the IU boundary formed by the caesura is fortified by these conceptually (nearly) empty expressions. As such, these can to a certain extent be compared to DMs functioning as filled pauses (cf. supra 2.5.3.4). In this context, it is useful to repeat that such filled pauses often co-occur with real, i.e. silent, breathing pauses and are thus part of a hesitant phase (Stenström 1990; Dehé & Wichmann 2010: 3).

Applied to my corpus, the precaesural and postcaesural verbal DMs and the caesura might then be conceived as one long (partly filled) pause. Indeed, one cannot escape the impression that the poet – rather than attempting to convey any conceptual meaning – seemingly runs out of breath and consciously makes an appeal to these “ready-made” verbal phrases in order to fill a beat in the flow of sound and thus apparently to gain time. Passages in which the need for a (prolonged) break is obvious are the following:

- (39) Ἀφὸν δὲ τὰ βυθίζουσι # τὰ κύματα, ὑψώνει  
 “Once the waves have submerged them (the ships), the water rises”  
 μέχρι καὶ εἰς τὰ σύγνοφα # τὸ ὕδωρ, ἀνεβαίνει  
 “as far as the clouds, it goes up,”  
 γοργότερον τὰ φέρνουσι # τὰ ὕδατα ἐκεῖνα  
 “those waters carry them faster”  
 παρὰ τὸ βέλος, ἤξευρε, # τοῦ τόξου ἢ τῆς τσάγγρας (BT 13800-13803)  
 “than the arrow, know, of the bow or the cross-bow [?]”

- (40) Κι ἀφότου τὸν ἐστέψασιν # κ’ ἐγίνη βασιλέας,  
 “And when they had crowned him and he had become king,”  
 σκάνταλον μέσα ἐγίνετον # καὶ ταραχὴ μεγάλη  
 “a quarrel broke out and a serious disagreement”  
 εἰς τοὺς Λουμπάρδους, σὲ λαλῶ, # ὁμοίως καὶ εἰς τοὺς Φραγκίσκους,  
 “among the Lombards, I tell you, and also among the French,”  
 ὅπου ἀγαποῦσαν καὶ ἤθελαν # νὰ γένη ὁ μαρκέσης  
 “who wished and desired that the marquis would become (emperor)”  
 ἐκεῖνος γὰρ τοῦ Μουφαρᾶ, # ὅπου ἦτον καπετάνος  
 “the one of Monteferrat, who was captain”  
 εἰς τὰ φουσσᾶτα καὶ λαόν, # καθὼς σὲ τὸ ἐπροεῖπα (CoM H 984-992)  
 “of the armies and the people, as I have told you before”

It is as if the poet wants to give himself a breathing space: ἤξευρε and σὲ λέγω lead up to a pause and are – in “collaboration” with the standard caesura – part of a hesitant phase. However, the perspective of the (potential) listener should not be disregarded, as successful communication always involves two parties. While giving himself a breathing pause, the poet is perhaps also conscious of the limits of his (real or fictitious) audience’s attention span: by uttering such a grammaticalised phrase, which creates a phase of low (conceptual) informativeness, he simultaneously helps the listener(s) to process his message. As a result, in their extent of being filled pauses, DMs are far from useless items, but have a clear time gaining function and are thus important means to contribute to the production and the processing of information.

Moreover, although an interpretation in terms of filled pauses might never become a safe-conduct to treat different DMs as being mutually exchangeable (cf. supra 2.5.3.4),

we observe that the DM derived from the epistemic imperative and the one derived from the reporting verb are used in similar constructions:

- (1) καὶ ὁμπρὸς παρὰ νὰ μάθωσιν # οἱ Ἕλληνες τὸ πρᾶγμα,  
 “and earlier than that the Greeks will learn the case,”  
 ζημίαν μεγάλην, λέγω σας, # νὰ πάθουν εἰς τὰς χώρας (BT 1526-1527)  
 “a huge damage, I tell you, they will suffer in the regions”
- (2) cf. ἔμπρὸς παρὰ νὰ μάθωσιν # οἱ Ἕλληνες τὸ πρᾶγμα,  
 “earlier than that the Greeks will learn the case,”  
 ζημίαν μεγάλην, ἤξευρε, # νὰ ποίσωμεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς». (BT 1599-1600)  
 “a huge damage, know, we will cause to them”

This supports our analysis of γνώριζε and λέγω as DMs functioning as “mere” filled pauses or at least testifies to their semantic bleaching.

Other expressions might serve similar pragmatic purposes. With regard to the vocatives, we have seen that they are acknowledged to have an IU segmenting function (Fraenkel’s “Gliedernde Funktion”) and thus also tend to circle around the IU boundary formed by the caesura (cf. supra 5.1.3.5). Interestingly, vocatives are sometimes also reckoned among the class of parentheticals (Schwyzer 1939).<sup>220</sup> Now, certain vocatives, in particular short ones, can perhaps also be compared to so-called filled pauses: their conceptual meaning seems so reduced that they no longer have a primarily addressing function. Rather, they seem to have a time gaining function. Especially the vocative φίλε (μου), on which the poet of *Livistros & Rodamni* is keen, seems an eligible candidate: it strikes the eye that φίλε (μου) is found in similar constructions as λέγω, in the first place in appositions (cf. supra 5.3.4.1.2.1):

- (3) Ἐσέβηκα εἰς τὴν τέντα μου, # ἔπεσα, ἐκοιμήθην  
 “I went into my tent, I fell down, I slept  
 ὕπνον ποτάπον, φίλε μου, # μυριομεριμνημένον (LR 1964-1965)  
 a kind of sleep, my friend, with ten thousands sorrows”
- (4) Εἶχε λιθάριν, φίλε μου, # καθάριον λυχνιτάριν (LR 1709)  
 “He had a (precious) stone, my friend, a pure stone”

---

<sup>220</sup> Cf. Wichmann (2001); Astruc (2005); cf. supra 2.5.2.3.

- (5) Καὶ ὥς ἔμαθα ἐκ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, # φίλε, τὸν ἐδικό μου (LR 1283)<sup>221</sup>  
“And when I learnt from the man, friend, my own (spokes)man”

In the next instance, φίλε can perhaps be said to signal a clarification of the zero subject (cf. supra 5.3.4.1.2.1):

- (6) καὶ ἐμὲν ἐπεχαιρέτησαν, # φίλε, οἱ ἐδικοί μου. (LR 1779)  
“and [they] wished me well, friend, my own pals”

As the DM-like instances of λέγω sometimes do, the following 4 examples seem to involve heavy information: they all contain a doubling construction (twice topic right-dislocation and twice topic left-dislocation; cf. supra 5.3.4.1.2.2):

- (7) Καὶ τί τὰ θέλω τὰ πολλά, # φίλε μου, τὰ ἐν μέσῳ; (LR 2036)  
“And why would I tell them, the many things, my friend, the things happened in the meantime?”
- (8) Εἶχεν τας ἡ καρδία μου, # φίλε, τὰς ἀπειλάς του (LR 2429)  
“My heart held them, friend, his assaults”
- (9) καὶ τὸ καθένα, φίλε μου, # νὰ σὲ τὸ ἀναδιδάξω. (LR 965)  
“and about every [eros], my friend, I will instruct you about it”
- (10) Καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα, φίλε μου, # τοῦ κάστρου νὰ τ’ ἀφήσω (LR 2252)  
“And the other things, my friend, concerning the castle, I will pass them by”

Furthermore, the next example of φίλε bears striking similarities to an example which I have listed among the procedural instances of λέγω and which I repeat here (cf. supra 5.3.4.1.2.1):

- (11) Τῆς δὲ Αἰγύπτου ὁ βασιλεύς, # φίλε, ὁ Βερδερίχος,  
“The king of Egypt, friend, Verderichos,”  
ἐκεῖνον τὸν ἐμήνυσαν # νὰ πάρῃ τὴν Ροδάμνην (LR 2369-2370)  
“the one of whom they say he kidnapped Rodamni”

---

<sup>221</sup> Consider also the following vocatives which seem to signal an apposition:

- (1) ὅλες οἱ συγγενίδες του, # ξένε, τοῦ Βερδερίχου (LR 3087)  
“all his relatives, stranger, (the relatives) of Verderichos”
- (2) «Καλὴ ἔναι ἡ στρατιωτικὴ, # ἄρχοντες, ἡ βουλὴ σας (AB 464)  
“Good is the strategy, archonts, your advice”
- (3) ἄς μάθω μόνον θέλημαν, # κόρη, τὸ ἐδικό σου (AB 1001)  
“let me learn but the will, girl, your own (will)”



cf. Ὁ τῆς Αἰγύπτου ὁ βασιλεὺς, # λέγω, ὁ Βερδερίχος,  
 “The king of Egypt, I say, Verderichos,”  
 μετὰ τοῦ μηχανήματος # καὶ μετὰ πανουργίας  
 “with his trickery and craftiness”  
 τὴν κόρην ἐπεχείρησεν # νὰ πάρῃ καὶ νὰ φύγῃ. (LR 2598-2600)  
 “attempted to take the girl and escape”

To conclude, I would like to come back to a phenomenon which has been extensively discussed in the very first chapter of this dissertation, namely formulas. Remember that formulas are (quasi-)identical half-verses which express a particular idea. The beginning of a new day, for instance, is very often announced by the formula ἡ νύξ ἐκείνη ἐδιέβηκεν in the *War of Troy*.<sup>222</sup>

- (1) Ἡ νύξ ἐκείνη ἐδιέβηκε, # κατέλαβεν ἡ ἡμέρα (BT 5026)  
 “That night passed, the day dawned”

Formulas are thus usually triggered by a specific frame of reference, namely by ideas, concepts and referents in the story (M. Jeffreys 1993b: 58).<sup>223</sup> The formula πηδᾷ, καβαλλικεύει, for instance, can only be used when a character moves; for example:

- (2) πολλὰ ἐντράπη, δυνατὰ, # πηδᾷ, καβαλλικεύει (BT 4532)  
 “he was greatly ashamed, and powerfully he leapt and mounted (his horse)”

Another example is πολλὰ εἰς ὀλίγην ὥραν, which occurs at a moment of high military achievement (E. & M. Jeffreys 1979: 134f.).<sup>224</sup>

- (3) τριακοσίους ἐσκότωσε # πολλὰ εἰς ὀλίγην ὥραν (BT 3137)  
 “he killed 300 men in a very short time”

As a consequence of their frequent use, formulas may also become semantically bleached. The famous formula μικροί τε καὶ μεγάλοι, for instance, no longer literally means “the small and the big ones”, but expresses the basic idea of “all” or “every” (E. & M. Jeffreys 1979: 129):

<sup>222</sup> Ἡ νύξ γὰρ ἐδιέβηκεν is a common variant, which shows that the ancient P2 particles can rather easily be omitted and thus provides further evidence for their bleached discourse role in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry; cf. supra 5.3.1.2.2.

<sup>223</sup> With regard to the Homeric formulas, Kirk (1985: 24) speaks of “a systematic corpus of phrases for different characters, objects and functions”. A prototypical Homeric example is a personal name followed by its formulaic epithet (cf. Shawcross 2009: 119; fn 21).

<sup>224</sup> Concerning the formula ἐδῶκαν κονταρέας, for instance, E. & M. Jeffreys (1979: 132f.) say that it is used for the beginnings of most knightly combats.

(4) Οἱ Τρῶες πατέρα σὲ εἶχασιν, # μικροί τε καὶ μεγάλοι (BT 5911)

“The Trojans considered you a father, the small and the big ones”

Formulas are thus actually ready-made building blocks which help the poet to structure the discourse by gaining time. As such, they resemble to a certain extent the procedural instances of γνώριζε and λέγω functioning as filled pauses.

With this link between a phenomenon typical of naturally spoken language (filled pauses) and a phenomenon typical of orally conceived poetry (formulas), I am back at the starting point of my modern linguistic approach towards the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry as a whole, i.e. the idea that naturally spoken language on the one hand and orally conceived poetry on the other show similar cognitive principles of producing and processing information. So it is time to pass to my conclusion.

## Chapter 6 Conclusion

### 6.1 A modern linguistic approach towards the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry as a whole

This dissertation was devoted to the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry. The language of this type of poetry, whose most representative genre is the romance (chapter 3), is not easily grasped. In the first place, it is renowned as our chief witness of vernacular literature from the 12<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup> centuries, yet it does not at all represent a purely vernacular language, but a so-called mixed language, for the poets now and then include ancient “dead” linguistic items (1.1.1). Moreover, it abounds with (quasi-)identical formulaic phrases (1.1.2). It is presumably this rather curious idiom – together with the prejudice that the metrical constraints of the πολιτικός στίχος impose a straitjacket on the language – that prevented linguists from thoroughly investigating the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry as a whole. Indeed, linguistic studies dealing with the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry all have a rather specific profile: they typically treat one grammatical aspect or are diachronically oriented. While such “fragmented” studies are of course unquestionably valid, what was lacking so far was thus a more comprehensive approach.

In this dissertation, I have offered and developed a theoretical framework in which the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry can *as a whole* be approached. More concretely, I have argued for the benefits of modern linguistic theory, Information Structure, for our understanding of its language, metre and discourse. The framework of IS has been founded on the basis of contemporary spoken languages and pays a lot of importance to pragmatics. However, I must admit that I was not the first to apply this framework to a so-called dead language (1.2.1). A line of research that served as a source of inspiration were successful IS-based studies on the *Iliad* and *Odysee*.

We have seen that although the Homeric epics superficially share some features with the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry (formulas, mixed language, label of *Kunstsprache*), they

testify to a different kind of orality. The LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry is *not* the direct product of an oral tradition and is thus *not* orally composed, but is the written work of literate poets – poets on whose style an oral tradition must have had some influence, though. This so-called oral-formulaic style hypothesis seems now widely accepted in the field, the term “oral” referring to the *conception* of the texts (and not necessarily to their medium). Furthermore, I also warned that “oral” cannot simply be equated with “spoken”, yet should get here a more restrictive interpretation, for it mainly refers to a stylistic, i.e. formulaic, issue (cf. *infra* 6.2).

Nonetheless, I share the belief that there are important parallels (similar cognitive principles of producing and processing information) between orally conceived poetry on the one hand and naturally spoken language on the other, without of course denying that the former is more stylised. This view led to the adoption of the modern linguistic framework of IS (1.2.2). More concretely, I have applied three basic concepts from IS to the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry: the IU, the topic/focus pair and the phenomenon of DMs (2.1). Although the theoretical framework of IS covers a wider range of notions, these three are considered crucial for (describing) the structuring of information and were thus leitmotifs throughout my dissertation (2.2).

### 6.1.1 Information/Intonation unit

A first application involved the well-established unit of spoken discourse, i.e. the IU, which is the standard unit of analysis in most IS-based studies. An IU is prototypically demarcated by a breathing pause and often corresponds to a syntactic unit. Moreover, it tends to stand in a simple paratactic relation with the surrounding IUs. This actually reflects the different cognitive grounds that underlie spoken discourse as compared to written language: a speaker organises his information less densely and thus imparts the information in smaller chunks rather than in complex grammatical sentences (2.3).

With regard to the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry too, the “traditional” notion of sentence does not make much sense and is best abandoned in favour of the IU. More precisely, I have argued that the fixed caesura at the eighth syllable implies an IU boundary and is – beside a metrical boundary – a prosodic boundary separating two IUs. This argument was based on a variety of metrical (e.g. avoidance of elision) and syntactico-semantic arguments (e.g. distribution of P2 particles). From this perspective, the two standard half-verses of the πολιτικὸς στίχος are not merely metrical units, but also cognitive units. Moreover, the fact that IUs *coincide* with the metrical patterns of the verse make clear that the verse rhythms of the πολιτικὸς στίχος are nothing to be

wrestled with, but – as Bakker has emphasised with regard to the Homeric discourse – should actually be considered stylisations of natural speech (5.1).

### 6.1.2 Topic/focus pair

A second application concerned the topic/focus pair. Albeit oft-used (especially in studies on word order), the notion is often not straightforwardly defined. In simplified words, the topic is that “what the utterance is about” and thus usually presents referentially given or active information, while the focus is that part of the utterance that constitutes the most prominent information and thus usually involves referentially new or inactive information. Somewhat confusingly, a distinction should be made between a topic in this strict (linguistic) sense (a so-called sentence topic) and a discourse topic, with which one refers to the central idea of a stretch of connected discourse (2.4).

With respect to LMG, only researchers interested in the distributional rules for OCPs (presumably the best-studied issue in LMG syntax) had already commented upon the validity of the topic/focus pair. More concretely, it was hypothesised that – beside a syntactic rule – a pragmatic principle too plays a part in the distribution of the LMG OCPs: next to function words and preferential words, ad hoc *focalised* constituents might also attract OCPs into preverbal position, whereas topicalised constituents are associated with postverbal OCPs. I have offered firm, i.e. more objective, evidence for this “focus hypothesis” by means of two complementary studies.

In a first study, the pragmatic principle was for the first time dealt with from the perspective of the verb. More precisely, so-called light verbs were the ideal test case: these verbs are so low in content that their direct objects with almost absolute certainty constitute the focus of the utterance. As expected, if preverbal, the direct objects always occurred with preverbal OCPs.

In a second study, I have gone more deeply into the phenomenon of clitic doubling. This construction has been identified in Standard Modern Greek as a special mechanism for marking objects as topics, yet has never been described in detail for LMG. I have discovered that both its modern four-part typology and its function already hold for clitic doubling in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry (yet LMG still differs from the modern standard language in the optionality of the construction and the OCP’s precise position as regards the verb).

In sum, these two studies have proven that the concepts of topic and focus (rather than the traditional machinery of SVO) are crucial means to describe the language of the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry (5.2).

### 6.1.3 Discourse markers

A third and final concept crucial within IS which I have applied to the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry is the phenomenon of DMs. Briefly, DMs are expressions that structure the discourse in some way or another rather than contributing to the conceptual content of an utterance. In other words, they have developed procedural meaning(s). Especially adverbs and verbs tend to enter this grammaticalisation cline. As such, the class of DMs includes a wide range of multifunctional items of which some operate as conduits between different segments of a text/discourse (textual DMs) and others mainly help to clarify the relationship between speaker and hearer (interpersonal DMs). Typically, DMs are syntactically independent, which is translated into a preference for initial position (in case of the adverbial DMs) or for a parenthetical position (in case of the verbal DMs) (2.5).

With regard to Ancient Greek, it has been established that the P2 particles can be compared to DMs. However, these gradually die out, so that by the time the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry is written, they are no longer used in contemporary speech. Nevertheless, the ancient P2 particles are still inserted by the πολιτικός στίχος poets. Therefore, I gave an overview of their functions in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry: a stylistic function (adding a classicizing flavour to a text), a rhythmical function (demarcating IUs), and even still a pragmatic one (exerting an – albeit bleached – discourse role). As such, they are far from being mere verse fillers (5.3.1). On the other hand, though, I looked for expressions which could have adopted the various pragmatic functions of the P2 particles – in other words: I searched for newly (or in any case more recently) developed DMs in my corpus and I identified both adverbial and verbal expressions which show DM-like behaviour (5.3.2).

As for the adverbial DMs, ἀπ(')αὐτοῦ, ἐδά(ρτε), ἐνταῦθα, ἐν τούτῳ, λοιπόν, πάλιν and πλὴν all seem eligible candidates. I devoted a special section to πάλιν, because this is the only expression which – in its DM-like use – does not occur initially, yet prefers to stand after the first word/constituent of the utterance. I derived that this positional difference (P1 vs. P2) actually reflects an important functional difference: signalling a switch in *discourse* topic (P1) vs. one in *sentence* topic (P2) (although a continuum might constitute a better way to present these two types of topics) (5.3.3).

As for the verbal DMs, I concentrated on the first person singular of the reporting verb λέγω (including λαλῶ) and the second person singular epistemic imperative γνώριζε (including ἐγνώριζε, γνώρισε, ἤξευρε and πρόσεχε). Tellingly, in their DM-like use, these are consistently used parenthetically. Whereas the adverbial DMs can all be considered topic switch markers and thus textual DMs (which does not mean that they are mutually exchangeable, though!), the verbal DMs rather belong to the interpersonal

ones. Λέγω, for instance, is shown to have a clear clarification-signalling function. With respect to γνώριζε, it was more difficult to pinpoint its precise pragmatic function. Finally, based on the observation that the verbal DMs (including φημί) tend to circle around the IU boundary formed by the caesura, I tentatively related them to filled pauses (5.3.4).

## 6.2 Corollary: linguistic foundation of the oral-formulaic style hypothesis

The application of the theory of IS to the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry cannot be disconnected from the oral-formulaic style hypothesis. As mentioned, the oral-formulaic style hypothesis has primarily been based on the phenomenon of formulas, which have played a leading part in the discussions and which were considered the oral style markers κατ' ἐξοχήν. In other words: formulaic phrases seemed the only tangible manifestations of the oral-formulaic style. Up to now, “oral” was synonymous with “formulaic” and thus referred to a merely stylistic issue (1.1.2.5.2).

As a result, an important corollary of my research is what can be called the “broadening” of the oral-formulaic style hypothesis, by giving it a more linguistic foundation. This linguistic foundation naturally followed from applying concepts that have been developed on the basis of spoken (!) languages. Moreover, in the course of this dissertation, I also called attention to a number of constructions which only make sense in spoken language: (corrective) afterthoughts, HTLD, repair RD and DMs functioning as filled pauses all result from the linear information flow of *spoken* language.<sup>1</sup> In this context, it is also relevant to recall that I have shown that the πολιτικὸς στίχος does not at all impose a metrical straitjacket on the language, but is, on the contrary, a very natural and flexible metre for the Greeks to compose in. This has been confirmed by two extensive case studies on clitics, in which I have demonstrated that the language of the πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry is not “distorted” by metrical constraints (chapter 4).

---

<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, many other phenomena which were touched upon in this dissertation are said to be typical of spoken rather than written language: I think, for instance, of appositions and light verbs.

Hence, the adoption of an oral-formulaic style *goes beyond mere stylistics*, i.e. beyond the “simple” insertion of formulas: the whole underlying conception of the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry is based on spoken discourse.<sup>2</sup> Reading the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry with this in mind is truly revealing. This approach does justice to its language, which is orally conceived (rather than barbarically!), and frees us from the preconceptions of written discourse. The abundance of καί, for instance, must be viewed in this light: καί should be analysed as an IU marker and its abundance thus testifies to the paratactic organisation typical of speech. With regard to the many P2 particles as well, we can conclude that they – albeit extinct in the contemporary spoken language – play an important role in demarcating IUs and thus help to uncover orally conceived structures. As such, not only many peculiar phenomena become understandable, it becomes also easier to enjoy this branch of literature.

To illustrate this, I repeat the “foretaste” examples given in my introduction (cf. supra 1.2.2.2), which we can now appreciate much more. The following constructions no longer need to be considered “awkward”, but are a logical consequence of the linear information flow of spoken language. The lack of grammatical agreement between the verb (ἔπαθεν; singular) and its subject (ἐκείνη καὶ ὁ Ἰμπερίας; plural) and between the OCP (τόν; singular) and its coreferential object (ἐκεῖνον καὶ τὴν κόρην; plural) becomes perfectly acceptable if we conceive the language of the πολιτικός στίχος as a concatenation of IUs. Thus, ἐκείνη καὶ ὁ Ἰμπερίας and ἐκεῖνον καὶ τὴν κόρην should be analysed as corrective afterthoughts added in a new IU:

- (1) πῶς ἔπαθεν ἐκ τὰς ἀρχὰς # ἐκείνη καὶ ὁ Ἰμπερίας. (IM 848)  
“how [she] suffered from the beginning, she and Imberios”
- (2) καὶ αὐτοὶ τοὺς τὸν ἐνδύσασιν # ἐκεῖνον καὶ τὴν κόρην (AB 1502)  
“and they got him dressed, him and the girl”

Rather than as a superfluous OCP, τὴν should be interpreted as an instance of clitic doubling, which serves a pragmatic means in the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry, namely marking the object as topic:

- (3) Ἐπέτασά τὴν τὴν γραφήν, ἐπῆρα, ἐφίλησά τὴν (LR 1747)  
“I took it, the letter, I held (it), I kissed it”

---

<sup>2</sup> In other words, one could say that I have determined the position of the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry on the continuum of spoken-written conception more sharply: we should situate this type of poetry more to the “more spoken” (or “more intimate” when adopting Oesterreicher’s terminology) end of the scale than we might have done solely on the basis of formulas; cf. supra: 1.1.2.5.1.



The next example too should be analysed as clitic doubling, more precisely as an instance of HTLD, for ὁ ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Ὡλενας is not just dangling at the beginning of the utterance. Rather, it is coreferential with the OCP τοῦ and serves the pragmatic purpose of introducing a new topic. As such, a translation which grabs the pragmatic nuance of this verse better might sound as follows: “the bishop of Olena, they gave him four fees”:

- (4) ὁ ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Ὡλενας # τέσσαρα φέε τοῦ ἐδῶκαν (CoM H 1957)  
Lurier (1964: 128): “the bishop of Olena was given four fees”

Instead of contributing to the conceptual content (“again”) of the utterance, πάλιν structures the discourse: it denotes a topic switch (from “I” to “you”) and should thus be analysed as a DM:

- (5) Ἐγὼ πατήρ σου εὐρίσκομαι, # ἐσὺ δὲ πάλιν υἱός μου (BT 11309)  
“I am your father, you (are) my son”

The same applies to our final example: σὲ λαλῶ is best conceived as a DM with a clarification-signalling function, as ἐκείνου τοῦ δεσπότη constitutes an apposition to τοῦ Καλοῖωάννη. As such, the English DM *I mean* might be a better rendering of the Greek:

- (6) ποῦ ἐλάλησαν καὶ εἶπασιν # ὅτι ἦλθαν τὰ φουσσᾶτα  
Lurier (1964: 99): “who talked and said that the armies were coming”  
τοῦ Καλοῖωάννη, σὲ λαλῶ, # ἐκείνου τοῦ δεσπότη. (CoM H 1101-1102)  
“(the armies) of Kalojohn, I tell you, that despot”

### 6.3 Further research: folk songs: continuity oral traditions?

I hope that by applying the theoretical framework of IS I have contributed to a more natural conception of the LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry and that this will in turn trigger further (pragmatically oriented) modern linguistic research on our chief witness of the LMG “vernacular” literature. Especially the area of newly developed DMs seems a promising path for future research, since it is likely that much more expressions can be used as DMs in LMG, given the fact that the multifunctional P2 particles died out. Such studies would allow for a more fine-grained analysis of specific expressions and, in turn, aid our interpretation of LMG πολιτικός στίχος poetry. As such, these are a desideratum for future translators of the poems, which often still lack a decent (English) translation.

Furthermore, they could also prevent editors from “correcting” certain linguistic phenomena, such as fossilised DMs.

However, in this last paragraph of my dissertation I would like to spotlight on one issue which captured my imagination while doing research, namely the possibility of a continuing oral tradition in Greece from Homer to the modern folk songs. Promponas (2008: 33) has already attempted to establish an age-long continuity by searching for thematic, linguistic and metrical similarities between the Homeric epics and the modern folk songs: “Ένα σημαντικό μέρος απο την ύλη των δημοτικών τραγουδιών έχει αρχηαίες ρίζες”.<sup>3</sup> However, the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry, which constitutes in my view a vital link, is neglected. As a matter of fact, I think that it would be the best to first investigate the connection between the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry and the modern folk songs composed in the πολιτικὸς στίχος before involving the Homeric epics, which are composed in another metre. Whereas research on shared literary themes has been rather disappointing, *linguistically* oriented research seems more promising. I have, for instance, suggested the possibility of a triple IU pattern in the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry, which would constitute a promising parallel with the threefolders in the modern folk songs (cf. supra 5.1.4). As such, further research with regard to the relationships between (the oral traditions of) the modern folk songs and the LMG πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry – and Homer – could perhaps finally provide the Greeks with “evidence for an unbroken link between the modern Greek world and its Byzantine and classical heritage” (Horrocks 2010<sup>2</sup>: 406).

Καὶ λέγω τὸ ἀμήν, ἀμήν καὶ παύομαι τὸν λόγον.

(Velthandros & Chrysandza 1350)

[ΤΕΛΟΣ]

“And I say ‘amen, amen’ and I stop my discourse”

[END]

---

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Sifakis’ (1992) article: “Homeric Survivals in the Medieval and Modern Greek Folksong Tradition?”; cf. Sifakis (1997).

# Bibliography

- Adams, J.N. (1994), Wackernagel's Law and the Position of Unstressed Personal Pronouns in Classical Latin, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 92.2, 103-178
- Aerts, W.J. (1990), Was the Author of the Chronicle of Morea that Bad? In V.D. Van Aalst & K. Ciggaar (eds.), *The Latin Empire: Some Contributions* (Hernen: A.A. Bredius Foundation), 133-163
- Aerts, W.J. (2005), The Lexikon to the Chronicle of Morea as a Tool for Linguistic Studies. In E. & M. Jeffreys (eds.), *Approaches to Texts in Early Modern Greek* (Oxford: University of Oxford), 141-151
- Aerts, W.J. & Hokwerda, H. (2002), *Lexicon on the Chronicle of Morea* (Groningen: Forsten)
- Agapitos, P.A. (1991), *Narrative Structure in the Byzantine Vernacular Romances. A Textual and Literary Study of Kallimachos, Belthandros and Libistros* (München: Institut für Byzantinistik und neugriechische Philologie)
- Agapitos, P.A. (2004), SO Debate: Comment on P.A. Agapitos, "Genre, Structure and Poetics in the Byzantine Vernacular Romances of Love", *Symbolae Osloenses* 79, 7-54
- Agapitos, P.A. (2006a), Ἀφήγησις Λιβίστρου καὶ Ῥοδάμνης Κριτική ἔκδοση τῆς διασκευῆς α (Athens: MIET)
- Agapitos, P.A. (2006b), Writing, Reading and Reciting (in) Byzantine Erotic Fiction. In B. Mondrain (ed.), *Lire et écrire à Byzance* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France), 125-176
- Agapitos, P.A., Hult, K. & Smith, O.L. (1999), *The Byzantine Achilleid. The Naples Version* (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften)
- Agapitos, P.A. & Smith, O.L. (1992), *The Study of Medieval Greek Romance: A Reassessment of Recent Work* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press)
- Aijmer, K. (1997), I think – An English Modal Particle. In S. Toril & O.J. Westvik (eds.), *Modality in Germanic Languages: Historical and Comparative Perspectives* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter), 1-47
- Aijmer, K. (2002), *English Discourse Particles: Evidence from a Corpus* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins)
- Aijmer, K. (2004), Pragmatic Markers in Spoken Interlanguage, *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 3.1, 173-190

- Aijmer, K. & Simon-Vandenberg, A.-M. (2011), Pragmatic Markers. In J. Zienkowski, J.-O. Östman & J. Verschueren (eds.), *Discursive Pragmatics* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 223-247
- Alexiadou, A. (2006), Left Dislocation including CLLD. In M. Everaert & H. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax* (Malden, MA: Blackwell), vol. 2, 668-699
- Alexiou, M. & Holton, D. (1976), The Origins and Development of Politikos Stichos: A Select Critical Bibliography, *Μαντατοφόρος* 9, 22-34
- Alexiou, S. (1985), *Βασίλειος Διγενής Ακρίτης* (Athens: s.n.)
- Alexopoulou, T. & Folli, R. (2011), Indefinite Topics and the Syntax of Nominals in Italian and Greek. In M.B. Washburn et al. (eds.), *WCCFL 28 Proceedings* (Somerville: Cascadia), 1-12
- Alexopoulou, T. & Kolliakou, D. (2002), On Linkhood, Topicalization and Clitic Left Dislocation, *Journal of Linguistics* 38.2, 193-245
- Allan, R.J. (2009), Orale elementen in de Homerische grammatica: intonatie-eenheid en enjambement, *Lampas* 42, 136-151
- Allan, R.J. (2012), Clause Intertwining and Word Order in Ancient Greek, *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 12, 5-28
- Allan, R.J. (2014), Topic Position in Ancient Greek Word Order, *Mnemosyne* 67.2, 181-213
- Allwood, J. (1996), Some Comments on Wallace Chafe's "How Consciousness Shapes Language", *Pragmatics and Cognition* 4.1, 1-18
- Altmann, H. (1981), *Formen der 'Herausstellung' im Deutschen: Rechtsversetzung, Linksversetzung, freies Thema und verwandte Konstruktionen* (Tübingen: Niemeyer)
- Amir, N., Silber-Varod, V. & Izre'el, S. (2004), Characteristics of Intonation Unit Boundaries in Spontaneous Spoken Hebrew-Perception and Acoustic Correlates. In B. Bel & I. Marlien (eds.), *Proceedings of Speech Prosody 2004* (Nara: ISCA), 677-680
- Anagnostopoulou, E. (1994), *Clitic Dependencies in Modern Greek*, PhD dissertation (University of Salzburg)
- Anagnostopoulou, E. (1999), Conditions on Clitic Doubling in Greek. In H. van Riemsdijk (ed.), *Clitics in the Languages of Europe* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter), 761-798
- Anaxagorou, N. (1998), *Narrative and Stylistic Structures in the Chronicle of Leontios Machairas* (Nicosia: A.G. Leventis Foundation)
- Anderson, S. R. (2005), *Aspects of the Theory of Clitics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Anis, J. (1998), *Texte et ordinateur: écriture réinventée?* (Bruxelles: De Boeck Université)
- Apostolopoulos, P. (1984), *La langue du roman Byzantin Callimaque et Chrysorrhoe* (Athens: Ακαδημία Αθηνών)
- Apostolopoulos, P. (1994), *Inventaire méthodique de linguistique byzantine (grec médiéval): essai d'une bibliographie raisonnée des travaux sur la langue byzantine (1880-1975)* (Salonique: Vaniass)
- Archakis, A. (2001), On Discourse Markers: Evidence from Modern Greek, *Journal of Pragmatics* 33, 1235-1261
- Astruc, L. (2005), The Form and Function of Extra-Sentential Elements, *Cambridge Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 2, 100-120

- Averintseva-Klisch, M. (2008), German Right Dislocation and Afterthought in Discourse. In A. Benz & P. Kühnlein (eds.), *Constraints in Discourse* (Amsterdam: Benjamins), 225-247
- Babiniotis, G. (1998), *Λεξικό της νέας ελληνικής γλώσσας* (Athens: Κέντρο Λεξικολογίας)
- Bakker, E.J. (1990a), Homeric Discourse and Enjambment: A Cognitive Approach, *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 120, 1-21
- Bakker, E.J. (1990b), Homerus als orale poëzie. De recente ontwikkelingen, *Lampas* 23, 384-405
- Bakker, E.J. (1993), Boundaries, Topics and the Structure of Discourse. An Investigation of the Ancient Greek particle *δέ*, *Studies in Language* 17, 275-311
- Bakker, E. J. (1997a), *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press)
- Bakker, E.J. (1997b), The Study of Homeric Discourse. In I. Morris & B. Powell (eds.), *A New Companion to Homer* (Leiden: Brill), 284-304
- Bakker, E.J. (1999), How Oral is Oral Composition? In E.A. Mackay (ed.), *Signs of Orality. The Oral Tradition and its Influence in the Greek and Roman World* (Leiden: Brill), 29-47
- Bakker, E. J. (2010), Pragmatics: Speech and Text. In E.J. Bakker (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell), 151-167
- Bakker, E. & Kahane, A. (1997), *Written Voices, Spoken Signs* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press)
- Bakker, S.J. & Wakker, G. (2009), *Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek* (Leiden: Brill)
- Bakker, W.F. & van Gemert, A.F. (1972), The RIMA PARHGORHTIKH of Marinos Phalieros. A Critical Edition with Introduction, Notes and Index Verborum. In W.F. Bakker, A.F. van Gemert & W.J. Aerts (eds.), *Studia Byzantina Et Neohellenica Neerlandica* (Leiden: Brill), 74-198
- Bakker, W.F. & van Gemert, A.F. (1988), *Ιστορία του Βελισαρίου* (Athens: MIET)
- Banti, G. (2013), Clefts, Epexegetic Focus Constructions, and Information Structure in Classical and Koine Greek. In M. Mancini & L. Lorenzetti (eds.), *Le lingue del Mediterraneo antico* (Roma: Carocci), 37-67
- Barri, N. (1971), *Essai de syntaxe structurale du dialecte neo-grec de Cappadoce*, PhD dissertation (Université de Paris, Sorbonne)
- Baud-Bovy, S. (1936), *La chanson populaire grecque du Dodécanèse* (Genève: A. Kundig)
- Baud-Bovy, S. (1973), Η επικράτηση του δεκαπεντασύλλαβου στο ελληνικό δημοτικό τραγούδι, *Ελληνικά* 26, 301-313
- Bäumel, F. (1984), Medieval Texts and the Two Theories of Oral-Formulaic Composition: A Proposal for a Third Theory, *New Literary History* 16.1, 31-49
- Beaton, R. (1980), *Folk Poetry of Modern Greece* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Beaton, R. (1988), *The Greek Novel, A.D. 1-1985* (London: Croom Helm)
- Beaton, R. (1986), The Oral Traditions of Modern Greece: A Survey, *Oral Traditions* 1.1, 110-133
- Beaton, R. (1989), Courtly Romances in Byzantium: A Case Study in Reception, *Mediterranean Historical Review* 4.2, 345-355
- Beaton, R. (1996<sup>2</sup>), *The Medieval Greek Romance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

- Beaton, R. (1996), The Byzantine Revival of the Ancient Novel. In G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill), 714-733
- Beaton, R. (2004), Balladry in the Medieval Greek World. In P.E. Bennett & R.F. Green (eds.), *The Singer and the Scribe: European Ballad Traditions and European Ballad Cultures* (Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi), 13-21
- Beaton, R. & Ricks, D. (1993), *Digenis Akritis: New Approaches to Byzantine Heroic Poetry* (Aldershot: Variorum)
- Beck, H-G. (1971), *Geschichte der byzantinischen Volksliteratur* (München: Beck)
- Bees, N.A. (1917), Zur Chronik von Morea, *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 13, 122-124
- Betts, G. (1995), *Three Medieval Greek Romances: Velthandros and Chryzandza, Kallimachos and Chrysorroï, Livistros and Rodamni* (New York/London: Garland)
- Bewster, A.C. (1992), Discourse and Relevance: The Case of Modern Greek Lipon, *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 12, 357-375
- Biraud, M. (2010), *Les interjections du théâtre grec antique. Étude sémantique et pragmatique* (Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters)
- Black, S. (2002), *Sentence Conjunctions in the Gospel of Matthew: καί, δέ, τότε, γάρ, σύν and Asyndeton in Narrative Discourse* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)
- Blakemore, D. (1987), *Semantic Constraints on Relevance* (Oxford: Blackwell)
- Blakemore, D. (2002), *Relevance and Linguistic Meaning: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse Markers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Blomqvist, J. (1969), *Greek Particles in Hellenistic Prose* (Lund: Gleerup)
- Boeckx, C. & Grohmann, K.K. (2005), Left Dislocation in Germanic. In W. Abraham (ed.), *Focus on Germanic Typology* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag), 131-144
- Bolkestein, A.M. (1981), Embedded Predications, Displacement and Pseudo-Argument Formation in Latin. In A. M. Bolkestein et al. (eds.), *Predication and Expression in Functional Grammar* (London: Academic Press), 63-112
- Bolly, C. (2014), Du verbe de perception visuelle au marqueur parenthétique ‘tu vois’: Grammaticalisation et changement linguistique, *Journal of French Language Studies* 22.2, 143-164
- Bolly, C. & Degand, L. (2013), Have you seen what I mean?: From Verbal Constructions to Discourse Markers, *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 14.2, 210-235
- Bonifazi, A. (2008), Memory and Visualization in Homeric Discourse Markers. In E.A. Mackay (ed.), *Orality, Literacy, Memory in the Ancient Greek and Roman World* (Leiden: Brill), 35-64
- Bouzouita, M. (2008), *The Diachronic Development of Spanish Clitic Placement*, PhD dissertation (King's College London)
- Brazil, D. (1997<sup>2</sup>), *The Communicative Value of Intonation in English* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Brinton, L.J. (1996), *Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter)
- Brinton, L.J. (2001), From Matrix Clause to Pragmatic Marker: The History of Look-Forms, *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 2.2, 177-199

- Brinton, L.J. (2005), Processes Underlying the Development of Pragmatic Markers: The Case of (*I*) say. In J. Skaffari et al. (eds.), *Opening Windows on Texts and Discourse of the Past* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 279-299
- Brinton, L.J. (2007), The Development of *I mean*: Implications for the Study of Historical Pragmatics. In S.M. Fitzmaurice & I. Taavitsainen (eds.), *Methods in Historical Pragmatics* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter), 37-79
- Brinton, L.J. (2008), *The Comment Clause in English: Syntactic Origins and Pragmatic Development* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Brinton, L.J. (2010), Discourse Markers. In A. Jucker & I. Taavitsainen (eds.), *Historical Pragmatics* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter), 285-314
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983), *Discourse Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Browning, R. (1999<sup>2</sup>), *Medieval and Modern Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Brugman, C. (2001), Light Verbs and Polysemy, *Language Sciences* 23.4-5, 551-578
- Butt, M. (2003), *The Light Verb Jungle*, paper given at the workshop “Multi-Verb Constructions”, Trondheim, 26-27/06/2003 (available at <http://edvarda.hf.ntnu.no/ling/tross/Butt.pdf>; last access: 20/12/2014)
- Carston, R. (2002), *Thoughts and Utterances: The Pragmatics of Explicit Communication* (Malden: Blackwell)
- Carter, R. & McCarthy, M. (1997), *Exploring Spoken English* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Cavallin, A. (1941), (τὸ) λοιπόν. Eine bedeutungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung, *Eranos* 39, 121-144
- Celano, G.A. (2013), Argument-focus and Predicate-focus Structure in Ancient Greek: Word Order and Phonology, *Studies in Language* 37.2, 241-266
- Chábová, K. (2010), Morfologické varianty v pozdněbyzantské řečtině a vliv metriky na jejich výběr v případě patnáctislabičného verse [Morphological Variants in Late Byzantine Greek and the Influence of Metrics on how they are Chosen in the Case of Fifteen-syllable Verse], *Avriga. Zprávy Jednoty klasických filologů* 52, 5-17
- Chafe, W.L. (1976), Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics, and Point of View. In C.N. Li & S.A. Thompson (eds.), *Subject and Topic* (New York: Academic Press), 27-55
- Chafe, W.L. (1980), *The Pear Stories: Cognitive, Cultural, and Linguistic Aspects of Narrative Production* (Norwood, N.J.: Ablex)
- Chafe, W.L. (1982), Integration and Involvement in Speaking, Writing and Oral Literature. In D. Tannen (ed.), *Spoken and Written Language: Exploring Orality and Literacy* (Norwood, N.J.: Ablex), 35-53
- Chafe, W.L. (1987), Cognitive Constraints on Information Flow. In R. Tomlin (ed.), *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse: Outcome of a Symposium, Eugene, Oregon* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 21-51
- Chafe, W.L. (1988), Linking Intonation Units in Spoken English. In J. Haiman & S.A. Thompson (eds.), *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 1-27

- Chafe, W.L. (1993), Prosodic and Functional Units of Language. In J.A. Edwards & M.D. Lampert (eds.), *Talking Data. Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research* (Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum), 33-43
- Chafe, W.L. (1994), *Discourse, Consciousness and Time: The Flow and Displacement of Conscious Experience in Speaking and Writing* (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press)
- Chafe, W.L. (1996), Inferring Identifiability and Accessibility. In T. Fretheim & J.K. Gundel (eds.), *Reference and Referent Accessibility* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 37-46
- Chafe, W.L. (1998), Language and the Flow of Thought. In M. Tomasello (ed.), *The New Psychology of Language: Cognitive and Functional Approaches to Language Structure* (Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum), 93-111
- Chafe, W.L. (2001), The Analysis of Discourse Flow. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H.E. Hamilton (eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (Oxford: Blackwell), 673-687
- Chanet, A.M. (1988), Objet propositionnel, prolepse et objet externe. In A. Rijksbaron, H. Mulder & G. Wakker (eds.), *In the Footsteps of Raphael Kühner. Proceedings of the International Colloquium in Commemoration of the 150th Anniversary of the Publication of Raphael Kühner's Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* (Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben), 67-97
- Chatzegiakoumes, M. (1977), *Τὰ μεσαιωνικά δημώδη κείμενα. Συμβολή στή μελέτη καὶ τὴν ἔκδοσὶ τους. Α': Λίβιστρος, Καλλίμαχος, Βέλθανδρος* (Athens: s.n.)
- Chatzidakis, G. (1905), *Μεσαιωνικά και Νέα Ελληνικά* (Athens: P. D. Sakellarios)
- Chatzikyriakidis, S. (2010), *Clitics in Four Dialects of Modern Greek: A Dynamic Account*, PhD dissertation (University of London)
- Chila-Markopoulou, D. (2004), Review of Pappas' "Variation and Morphosyntactic Change in Greek: From Clitics to Affixes", *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 5, 199-212
- Christodoulidou, M. (2011), Lexical Markers within the University Lecture, *Novitas-ROYAL* 5.1, 143-160
- Cinque, G. (1990), *Types of  $\bar{A}$ -Dependencies* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press)
- Clancy, P.M., Suzuki, R., Tao, H. & Thompson, S.A. (1996), The Conversational Use of Reactive Tokens in English, Japanese, and Mandarin, *Journal of Pragmatics* 26.1, 355-387
- Clarysse, W. (2010), Linguistic Diversity in the Archive of Engineers Kleon and Theodoros. In T. Evans & D. Obbink (eds.), *The Language of the Papyri* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 35-50
- Company Company, C. (2006), Subjectification of Verbs into Discourse Markers: Semanto-pragmatic Change Only?, *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 20, 97-121
- Conca, F. (1986), Il romanzo nell'eta dei Paleologi: temi e strutture. In H.G. Beck, F. Conca & C. Cupane (eds.), *Il romanzo tra cultura latina e cultura bizantina* (Palermo: Enchiridion), 33-45
- Condoravdi, C. & Kiparsky, P. (2001), Clitics and Clause Structure, *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 2, 1-39
- Condoravdi, C. & Kiparsky, P. (2004), Clitics and Clause Structure: The Late Medieval System, *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 5, 159-183



- Conti, L. (2012a), *The Non-Defined Boundaries between Prototypical Adverbs and Discourse Markers in Homer*, paper given at the workshop “Syntactic Change and Syntactic Reconstruction: New Perspectives”, Zurich, 28/09/2012
- Conti, L. (2012b), Los adverbios conjuntivos en griego antiguo: Análisis de ἄμα en Homero, Platón y Jenofonte, *Emerita, Revista de Lingüística y Filología Clásica* 80.1, 45-68
- Conti, L. (2012c), Zu Konjunkionaladverbien im Altgriechischen: Analyse von ἔπειτα bei Homer, *Historical Linguistics* 125.1, 68-80
- Cormier, R. (1997), Review Betts, *The Medieval Review* 97.02.07
- Crespo, E. (2011), Conjunctive Adverbs: A Neglected Chapter of Greek Grammar. In E.R. Luján & J.L. García Alonso (eds.), *A Man in the Iberian Street, Papers in Linguistics and Epigraphy in Honour of Javier de Hoz* (Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck), 35-44
- Croft, W. (1995), Intonation Units and Grammatical Structure, *Linguistics* 33, 839-882
- Crosby, R. (1936), Oral Delivery in the Middle Ages, *Speculum* 11, 88-110
- Crosby, R. (1938), Chaucer and the Custom of Oral Delivery, *Speculum* 13, 413-432
- Cruttenden, A. (1997<sup>2</sup>), *Intonation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Crystal, D. (1975), *The English Tone of Voice* (London: Edward Arnold)
- Crystal, D. (2003<sup>5</sup>), *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (Malden: Blackwell)
- Cupane, C. (1995), *Romanzi cavallereschi bizantini: Callimaco e Crisorroe; Beltandro e Crisanza; Storia di Achille; Florio e Plaziaflore; Storia di Apollonio di Tiro; Favola consolatoria sulla Cattiva e la Buona Sorte* (Torino: Unione Tipografica)
- Cupane, C. (2003), Wie volkstümlich ist die Byzantinische Volksliteratur? *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 96, 577-599
- Cysouw, M. (2003), *Towards a Typology of Pronominal Cliticization*, paper given at the congress “ALT V”, Cagliari, 15-18/09/2003
- Davies, A.M. (1997), Particles in Greek Epigraphical Texts: The Case of Arcadian. In A. Rijksbaron (ed.), *New Approaches to Greek Particles* (Amsterdam: Gieben), 49-73
- Dawkins, R.M. (1916), *Modern Greek in Asia Minor; A Study of the Dialects of Silli, Cappadocia and Phárasa, with Grammar, Texts, Translations and Glossary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Dawkins, R.M. (1939), Graeco-Barbara, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 38.1, 1-30
- De Boel, G. (2008), The Genesis of Clitic Doubling from Ancient to Medieval Greek. In D. Kallulli & L. Tasmowski (eds.), *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 89-103
- Dehé, N. (2007), The Relation between Syntactic and Prosodic Parenthesis. In N. Dehé & Y. Kavalova (eds.), *Parentheticals* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 261-284
- Dehé, N. (2014), *Parentheticals in Spoken English The Syntax-Prosody Relation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Dehé, N. & Kavalova, Y. (2007), Parentheticals: An Introduction. In N. Dehé & Y. Kavalova (eds.), *Parentheticals* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 1-22

- Dehé, N. & Wichmann, A. (2010), The Multifunctionality of Epistemic Parentheticals in Discourse: Prosodic Cues to the Semantic-Pragmatic Boundary, *Functions of Language* 17.1, 1-28
- Denniston, J.D. (1954<sup>2</sup>), *The Greek Particles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Devine, A.M. & Stephens, L.D. (2000), *Discontinuous Syntax. Hyperbaton in Greek* (New York: Oxford University Press)
- de Vries, M. (2007), Dislocation and Backgrounding, *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 24.1, 35-47
- Diewald, G. (2011), Pragmaticalization (Defined) as Grammaticalization of Discourse Functions, *Linguistics* 49.2, 365-390
- Dik, H. (1995), *Word Order in Ancient Greek. A Pragmatic Account of Word Order Variation in Herodotus* (Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben)
- Dik, H. (2007), *Word Order in Greek Tragic Dialogue* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Dik, S.C. (1997<sup>2</sup>), *The Theory of Functional Grammar* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter)
- Dimitriadis, A. (1994), Clitics and Island-Insensitive Object-Drop, *Proceedings of FLSM 5, Urbana-Champaign* 24.2
- Doody, M.A. (1996), *The True Story of the Novel* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press)
- Dover, K.J. (1960), *Greek Word Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Dover, K.J. (1997), *Evolution of Greek Prose Style* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Drettas, G. (1999), The Greek-Pontic Dialect Group. In A.F. Christidis (ed.), *Dialect Enclaves of the Greek Language* (Athens: Centre for the Greek Language), 91-100
- Duhoux, Y. (1997), Grec écrit et Grec parlé. Une étude contrastive des particules au Ve-IVe siècles. In A. Rijksbaron (ed.), *New Approaches to Greek Particles* (Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben), 15-48
- Duhoux, Y. (2000), Particules à emploi "métrique" selon Denys le Thrace, *Emerita* 68, 31-46
- Edwards, M. (2002), *Sound, Sense, and Rhythm* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press)
- Egea, J.M. (1988), *Gramática de la Crónica de Morea: un estudio sobre el griego medieval* (Vitoria: Instituto de Ciencias de la Antigüedad, Universidad del País Vasco)
- Egea, J.M. (1990), Notas sobre dos partículas del griego medio, *Veleia* 7, 293-301
- Egea, J.M. (1993), Les particules en grec médiéval. In N.M. Panayotakis (ed.), *Origini della letteratura neogreca* (Venezia: Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini di Venezia), vol. 1, 109-117
- Egea, J.M. (1998), *Historia extraordinaria de Beltandro y Crisanza* (Granada: Athos-Pérgamos)
- Eideneier, H. (1983a), Leser- oder Hörerkreis? Zur byzantinischen Dichtung in der Volkssprache, *Ελληνικά* 34, 119-150
- Eideneier, H. (1983b), Zur Mündlichen Überlieferung Byzantinischer Dichtung in der Volkssprache, *Homonia* 5, 218-241
- Eideneier, H. (1987), Der Ptochoprodromos in schriftlicher und mündlicher Überlieferung. In H. Eideneier (ed.), *Neograeca medii aevi: Text und Ausgabe. Akten zum Symposium Köln 1986* (Cologne: Romiosini Verlag), 101-119

- Eideneier, H. (1989), KAI als Auftakt zur (rhythmischen) Phrase. Zur verbalisierten Pausenmarkierung im Mittel- und Neugriechischen, *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 39, 179-200
- Eideneier, H. (1991), *Ptochoprodromos: Kritische Ausgabe der vier Gedichte* (Cologne: Romiosini)
- Eideneier, H. (1998), Ist der Diaskevas ein sprechsingender Schreiber?. In I. Vassis, G.S. Henrich & D. Reinsch (eds.), *Lesarten. Festschrift für Athanasios Kambylis* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter), 240-247
- Eideneier, H. (1999), *Von Rhapsodie zu Rap: Aspekte der griechischen Sprachgeschichte von Homer bis heute* (Tübingen: Narr)
- Eideneier, H. (2001), Τι σημαίνει “προφορική παράδοση” στα κείμενα της δημώδους γραμματείας; In H. Eideneier, U. Moennig & N. Toufexis (eds.), *Θεωρία και πράξη των εκδόσεων της υστεροβυζαντινής, αναγεννησιακής και μεταβυζαντινής δημώδους γραμματείας* (Heraklion: Crete University Press), 47-58
- Eideneier, H., Moennig, U. & Toufexis, N. (2001), *Θεωρία και πράξη των εκδόσεων της υστεροβυζαντινής, αναγεννησιακής και μεταβυζαντινής δημώδους γραμματείας* (Heraklion: Crete University Press)
- Erman, B. (2001), Pragmatic Markers Revisited with a Focus on You Know in Adult and Adolescent Talk, *Journal of Pragmatics* 33.9, 1337-1359
- Estigarribia, B. (2006), Why Clitic Doubling? A Functional Analysis for Rioplatense Spanish. In T.L. Face & C.A. Klee (eds.), *Selected Proceedings of the 8th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium* (Somerville: Cascadilla), 123-136
- Evans, T.V. (2010), Standard Koine Greek in Third Century BC Papyri. In T. Gagos & A. Hyatt (eds.), *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Congress of Papyrology, Ann Arbor, July 29-August 4, 2007* (Ann Arbor: Scholarly Publishing Office), 197-206
- Fagard, B. (2010), É vida, olha...: Imperatives as Discourse Markers and Grammaticalization Paths in Romance: A Diachronic Corpus Study, *Languages in Contrast* 10.2, 245- 267
- Failler A. (1997), Review on M. Papathomopoulos & E. Jeffreys “Ο Πόλεμος της Τρωάδος”, *Revue des études byzantines* 55.1, 345-346
- Fedriani, C., Ghezzi, C. & Molinelli, P. (2012), *Constraining Pragmaticalization: Paths of Development from Lexicon to Discourse*, paper given at the congress “New Reflections on Grammaticalisation V”, Edinburgh, 16-19/07/2012
- Féry, C. (2006), The Fallacy of Invariant Phonological Correlates of Information Structural Notions. In C. Féry, G. Fanselow & M. Krifka (eds.), *The Notions of Information Structure* (Potsdam: Universitätsverlag Potsdam), 1-21
- Féry, C., Fanselow, G. & Krifka, M. (eds.) (2006), *The Notions of Information Structure* (Potsdam: Universitätsverlag Potsdam)
- Fischer, K. (2006), Towards an Understanding of the Spectrum of Approaches to Discourse Markers: Introduction to the Volume. In K. Fischer (ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles* (Amsterdam: Elsevier), 1-20
- Fleischman, S. (1985), Discourse Functions of Tense-Aspect Oppositions in Narrative: Toward a Theory of Grounding, *Linguistics* 23, 851-882

- Fludernik, M. (1991), The Historical Present Tense Yet Again: Tense Switching and Narrative Dynamics in Oral and Quasi-Oral Storytelling, *Text* 11, 365-397
- Forchini, P. (2010), "I mean, what was that about?". Spontaneous and Movie Conversation Compared, *L'Analisi Linguistica e Letteraria* 18, 323-334
- Fraenkel, E. (1932), Kolon und Satz. Beobachtungen zur Gliederung des antiken Satzes I, *Nachrichten der Gottinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, philologisch-historische Klasse*, 73-92
- Fraenkel, E. (1933), Kolon und Satz. Beobachtungen zur Gliederung des antiken Satzes II. *Nachrichten der Gottinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, philologisch-historische Klasse*, 319-354
- Fraenkel, E. (1957), *Horace* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Fraenkel, E. (1965), *Noch einmal Kolon und Satz* (München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften)
- Frascarelli, M. & Hinterhölzl, R. (2007), Types of Topics in German and Italian. In S. Winkler & K. Schwabe (eds.), *On Information Structure, Meaning and Form* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 87-116
- Fraser, B. (1988), Types of English Discourse Markers, *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 38, 19-33
- Fraser, B. (1990), An Approach to Discourse Markers, *Journal of Pragmatics* 14, 383-395
- Fraser, B. (1999), What are Discourse Markers? *Journal of Pragmatics* 31, 931-952
- Funk, R.W. (1961), *Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (revision of Blass-Debrunner) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)
- Geluykens, R. (1992), *From Discourse Process to Grammatical Construction: On Left-Dislocation in English* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins)
- Geluykens, R. (1994), *The Pragmatics of Discourse Anaphora in English. Evidence From Conversational Repair* (Berlin/NewYork: de Gruyter)
- Georgakopoulou, A. & Goutsos, D. (1998), Conjunctions versus Discourse Markers in Greek: The Interaction of Frequency, Position and Functions in Context, *Linguistics* 36.5, 887-917
- George, C.H. (2009), Greek Particles: Just a Literary Phenomenon?. In S.J. Bakker & G. Wakker (eds.), *Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek* (Leiden: Brill), 155-170
- Ghezzi, C. & Molinelli, P. (2014), Italian *guarda, prego, dai*. Pragmatic Markers and the Left and Right Periphery. In K. Beeching & U. Detges (eds.), *The Role of the Left and Right Periphery in Semantic Change* (Amsterdam: Benjamins), 117-150
- Giannouli, A. (2011), Introduction. In A. Giannouli, A. & E. Schiffer (eds.), *From Manuscripts to Books: Proceedings of the International Workshop on Textual Criticism and Editorial Practice for Byzantine Texts* (Vienna, 10-11 December 2009) (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften), 17-24
- Givón, T. (1979), *On Understanding Grammar* (New York: Academic Press)
- Givón, T. (1983), *Topic Continuity in Discourse* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins)
- Givón, T. (2001), *Syntax: An Introduction* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins)
- Goldstein, D.M. (2008), Review Helma Dik, *Word Order in Greek Tragic Dialogue*, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2008.06.08

- Goldstein, D.M. (2010), *Wackernagel's Law in Fifth-Century Greek*, PhD dissertation (University of California, Berkeley)
- González Merino, J.I., (1981), Las particulas en Menandro, *Estudios Clásicos* 86.3, 163-184
- González, M. (2005), Pragmatic Markers and Discourse Coherence Relations in English and Catalan Oral Narrative, *Discourse Studies* 7.1, 53-86
- Goutsos, D. (1994), Exploring Discourse Conditions on Word Order Phenomena in Greek, *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 12.2, 171-184
- Goutsos, D. (1997), *Modeling Discourse Topic. Topic: Sequential Relations and Strategies in Expository Text* (Norwood, N.J.: Ablex)
- Granberg, R. (1999), Clitic Position in Thirteenth-Century Spanish: Sentences with Preverbal Subject, *La corónica* 27.2, 89-113
- Grenoble, L.A. (1998), *Deixis and Information Packaging in Russian Discourse* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins)
- Grohmann, K.K. (1997), On Left Dislocation. In W. Abraham & K.K. Grohmann (eds.), *Groninger Arbeiten in germanistischer Linguistik* 40 (Groningen: Germanistisch Instituut), 1-33
- Grosz, B. & Ziv, Y. (1998), Centering, Global Focus, and Right Dislocation. In M.A.J. Walker & E. Prince (eds.), *Centering Theory in Discourse* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 293-307
- Guentchéva, Z. (2008), Object Clitic Doubling Constructions and Topicality in Bulgarian. In D. Kallulli & L. Tasmowski (eds.), *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 203-223
- Gundel, J.K. (1988), Universals of Topic-Comment Structure. In M. Hammond, E. Moravczik & J. Wirth (eds.), *Studies in Syntactic Typology* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 209-239
- Gundel, J.K. & Fretheim, T. (2004), Topic and Focus. In L. Horn & G. Ward (eds.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics* (Oxford: Blackwell), 175-196
- Gundel, J.K., Hedberg, N. & Zacharski, R. (1993), Cognitive Status and the Form of Referring Expressions in Discourse, *Language* 69, 274-307
- Gupton, T. (2012), Object Clitics in Galician and Complications for Clausal Analyses. In K. Geeslin & M. Díaz-Campos (eds.), *Selected Proceedings of the 14th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium* (Somerville: Cascadia), 272-284
- Haberland, H. & Van der Auwera, J. (1987), Doubling and Resumption in Modern Greek, *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 8, 323-334
- Halford, B.K. (1996), *Talk Units. The Structure of Spoken Canadian English* (Tübingen: Narr)
- Hall, A. (2007), Do Discourse Connectives Encode Concepts or Procedures? *Lingua* 117, 149-174
- Halla-Aho, H. (2008), *The Non-Literary Latin Letters. A Study of their Syntax and Pragmatics*, PhD dissertation (University of Helsinki)
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1985), *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (London: Arnold)
- Havers, W. (1925), Der sog. ‚Nominativus Pendens‘, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 43, 207-257
- Hedberg, N. (2006), Topic-Focus Controversies. In V. Molnár & S. Winkler (eds.), *The Architecture of Focus* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter), 105-136

- Hedberg, N. & Fadden, L. (2007), The Information Structure of It-clefts, Wh-clefts and Reverse Wh-clefts in English. In N. Hedberg and R. Zacharski (eds.), *The Grammar-Pragmatics Interface: Essays in Honor of Jeanette K. Gundel* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 49-76
- Heeman, P.A. & Allen, J.F. (1999), Speech Repairs, Intonational Phrases, and Discourse Markers: Modeling Speakers' Utterances in Spoken Dialogue, *Journal of Computational Linguistics* 25.4, 527-571
- Helasvuo, M.-L. (2001), *Syntax in the Making: The Emergence of Syntactic Units in Finnish Conversation* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins)
- Henrichsen, R.J. (1839), *Ueber die sogenannten politischen Verse bei den Griechen. Aus dem Dänischen übersetzt von Friedrichsen* (Leipzig: s.n.)
- Hesseling, D.C. (1938), Le Roman de Belthandros et Chrysantza, *Neophilologus* 23, 375-379
- Hinterberger, M. (1993), Sprachliche Variationsformen in volkssprachlichen metrischen Werken der spätbyzantinischen und frühneugriechischen Zeit. In N. Panayotakis (ed.), *Origini della Letteratura Neogreca* (Venezia: Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini di Venezia), vol. 1, 158-168
- Hinterberger, M. (2000), Δημώδης και λόγια λογοτεχνία: Διαχωριστικές γραμμές και συνδετικοί κρίκοι, in: P. Odorico & P. Agapitos (eds.), *Pour une nouvelle histoire de la littérature byzantine* (Paris: Centre d'étude byzantines), 153-165
- Hinterberger, M. (2001), Το φαινόμενο της πολυτυπίας σε δημώδη κείμενα. In H. Eideneier, U. Moennig, & N. Toufexis (eds.), *Θεωρία και πράξη των εκδόσεων της υστεροβυζαντινής, αναγεννησιακής και μεταβυζαντινής δημώδους γραμματείας* (Heraklion: Crete University Press), 215-244
- Hinterberger, M. (2006), *How Should We Define Vernacular Literature?*, paper given at the congress "Unlocking the Potential of Texts: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Medieval Greek", Cambridge, 18-19/07/2006 (available at: <http://www.mml.cam.ac.uk/greek/grammarofmedievalgreek/unlocking/html/Hinterberger.html>; last access: 05/11/2014)
- Hinterberger, M. (2007), Die Sprache der byzantinischen Literatur: Der Gebrauch der synthetischen Plusquamperfektformen. In M. Hinterberger & E. Schiffer (eds.), *Byzantinische Sprachkunst. Studien zur byzantinischen Literatur gewidmet Wolfram Hörandner zum 65. Geburtstag* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter), 107-142
- Hinterberger, M. (2014), *The Language of Byzantine Learned Literature* (Turnhout: Brepols)
- Hoffmann, M.E. (1989), A Typology of Latin Theme Constituents. In M. Lavency & D. Longrée (eds.), *Actes du Ve Colloque de Linguistique latine* (Leuven: Peeters), 185-196
- Hofmann, J.B. (1951<sup>3</sup>), *Lateinische Umgangssprache* (Heidelberg: Winter)
- Holton, D. (1990), Orality in Cretan Narrative Poetry, *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 14, 186-198
- Holton, D., Lendari, T., Moennig, U. & Vejleskov, P. (2005), *Copyists, Collectors, Redactors and Editors: Manuscripts and Editions of Late Byzantine and Early Modern Greek Literature* (Heraklion: Crete University Press)

- Holton, D., Mackridge, P. & Philippaki-Warbuton, I. (1997), *Greek. A Comprehensive Grammar of the Modern Language* (London/New York: Routledge)
- Holton, D., Mackridge, P. & Philippaki-Warbuton, I. (2004), *Greek. An Essential Grammar of the Modern Language* (London/New York: Routledge)
- Holton, D. & Manolissou, I. (2010), Medieval and Early Modern Greek. In E. Bakker (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language* (Chicester: Wiley-Blackwell), 539-563
- Hörander, W. (1981), *Der Prosarhythmus in der rhetorischen Literatur der Byzantiner* (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften)
- Horrocks, G.C. (1990), Clitics in Greek: a Diachronic Review. In M. Roussou & S. Panteli (eds.), *Greek outside Greece II* (Athens: Diaspora), 35-52
- Horrocks, G.C. (2010<sup>2</sup>), *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers* (London: Longman)
- Iten, C. (2005), *Linguistic Meaning, Truth Conditions and Relevance: The Case of Concessives* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan)
- Iwasaki, S. (1993), The Structure of the Intonation Unit in Japanese. In S. Choi (ed.) *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* (Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information), vol. 3, 39-53
- Iwasaki, S. (1996), The Syntactic and Functional Structures of Intonation Unit in Thai, *The Fourth International Symposium on Language and Linguistics* (Thailand: Institute of Language and Culture for Rural Development at Mahidol University), 750-761
- Iwasaki, S. & Tao, H. (1993), *A Comparative Study of the Structure of the Intonation Unit in English, Japanese, and Mandarin Chinese*, paper given at the annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, Los Angeles, 09/01/1993
- Izre'el, S. (2005), Intonation Units and the Structure of Spontaneous Spoken Language: A View from Hebrew. In C. Auran et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the IDP05 International Symposium on Discourse-Prosody Interfaces* (Aix-en-Provence: cd-rom)
- Jaeger, T.F. & Gerassimova, V.A. (2002), Bulgarian Word Order and the Role of the Direct Object Clitic in LFG. In M. Butt & T.H. King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG02 Conference* (Stanford: CSLI Publications)
- Jannaris, A.N. (1897), *An Historical Greek Grammar Chiefly of the Attic Dialect* (London: Macmillan)
- Janse, M. (1991), La phrase segmentée en grec ancien: le témoignage des enclitiques, *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 86.1, 14-16
- Janse, M. (1993a), La position des pronoms personnels enclitiques en grec néo-testamentaire à la lumière des dialectes néo-helléniques. In C. Brixhe (ed.), *La koiné grecque antique I* (Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy), 83-121
- Janse, M. (1993b), The Prosodic Basis of Wackernagel's Law. In A. Crochetière, J.-C. Boulanger & C. Ouellon (eds.), *Les langues menacées. Actes du XVe Congrès international des linguistes, Québec, Université Laval, 9-14 août 1992* (Sainte-Foy: Presses de l'Université Laval), vol. 4, 19-22
- Janse, M. (1994a), De la Loi de Wackernagel et ses extensions en Latin: à propos de la collocation pronominale chez Pétrone, *TEMA. Techniques et Méthodologies Modernes Appliquées à l'Antiquité* 1, 107-146 (Paris: Laboratoire LITALA, Université Paris 7)

- Janse, M. (1994b), Son of Wackernagel: The Distribution of Object Clitic Pronouns in Cappadocian. In Philippaki-Warbuton, Nicolaidis & Sifianou (eds.), 435-442
- Janse, M. (1996-97), Regard sur les études de linguistique byzantine (grec médiéval), *Orbis* 39, 193-244
- Janse, M. (1998a), Homerische metriek. Orale poëzie in de praktijk, *Didactica Classica Gandensia* 38, 125-151
- Janse, M. (1998b), Cappadocian Clitics and the Syntax-Morphology Interface. In B.D. Joseph, G.C. Horrocks & I. Philippaki-Warbuton (eds.), *Themes in Greek Linguistics II* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 257-281
- Janse, M. (1998c), Grammaticalization and Typological Change. The Clitic Cline in Inner Asia Minor Greek. In M. Janse (ed.), *Productivity and Creativity: Studies in General and Descriptive Linguistics in Honor of E. M. Uhlenbeck* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter), 521-547
- Janse, M. (2000), Convergence and Divergence in the Development of the Greek and Latin Clitic Pronouns. In R. Sornicola, E. Poppe & A. Shisha-Halevy (eds.), *Stability Variation and Change of Word-Order Patterns over Time* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 231-258
- Janse, M. (2002), Review article: Aspects of Pontic Grammar, *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 3.1, 203-231
- Janse, M. (2003), The Metrical Schemes of the Hexameter, *Mnemosyne* 56, 343-348
- Janse, M. (2006), Object Position in Cappadocian and Other Asia Minor Greek Dialects. In M. Janse, B.D. Joseph & A. Ralli (eds.), *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory (Mytilene 2004)* (Patras: University of Patras), 115-129
- Janse, M. (2008), Clitic Doubling from Ancient to Asia Minor Greek. In D. Kallulli & L. Tasmowski (eds.), *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 165-202
- Janse, M. (2012), *Inleiding tot de Homerische taal en metriek* (Gent: Academia Press)
- Janse, M. & Joseph, B.D. (2014), A New Historical Grammar of Demotic Greek: Reflections on the Κοινή Ελληνική in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Centuries as seen through Thumb's Handbook of the Modern Greek Vernacular, *CHS Research Bulletin* 2.2 (available at: <http://wp.chs.harvard.edu/chs-fellows/2014/11/28/demotic-greek/>; last access: 20/12/2014)
- Janse, M. & Tol, S. (1998), A Discourse Approach to Polish Clitic Placement. In B. Caron (ed.), *Proceedings of the XVIth International Congress of Linguists, Paris, 20-25 July 1997* (Oxford: cd-rom)
- Jansen, F. (1981), *Syntaktische constructies in gesproken taal* (Amsterdam: Huis aan de Drie Grachten)
- Janssen, M.C. (1998), Η πρόταξη και επίταξη του αδύνατου τύπου της προσωπικής αντωνυμίας την εποχή του Ερωτόκριτου και της Θυσίας του Αβραάμ, *Cretan Studies* 6, 129-144
- Jeffreys, E. (1979), The Popular Byzantine Verse Romances of Chivalry: Work Done since 1971, *Μαντατοφόρος* 14, 20-34



- Jeffreys, E. (1981), The Later Greek Verse Romances: A Survey. In E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys & A. Moffatt (eds.), *Byzantine Papers: Proceedings of the First Australian Byzantine Studies Conference, Canberra, 17-19 May 1978*, 116-127
- Jeffreys, E. (1998), *Digenis Akritis. The Grottaferrata and Escorial Versions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Jeffreys, E. (2007), Review Ulrich Moennig “Die Erzählung von Alexander und Semiramis”, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 100.2, 870-872
- Jeffreys, E. (2008), Review Edition Agapitos: Ἀφήγησις Λιβίστρου καὶ Ῥοδάμνης Κριτική ἔκδοσις τῆς διασκευῆς α, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 101.1, 231-233
- Jeffreys, E. (2011), Medieval Greek Epic Poetry. In K. Reichl (ed.), *Medieval Oral Literature* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter), 459-484
- Jeffreys, E. (2012a), *Four Byzantine Novels* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press)
- Jeffreys, E. (2012b), *A Date and Context for the War of Troy*, paper given at the congress “NeoGraeca Medii Aevi VII”, Heraklion, 01-04/11/2012
- Jeffreys, E. (2013), Byzantine Romances: Eastern or Western? In M. Brownlee & D. Gondicas (eds.), *Renaissance Encounters: Greek East and Latin West* (Leiden: Brill), 217-234
- Jeffreys, M. (1972), *Studies in the Language and Style of the Medieval Greek Chronicle of the Mores*, PhD dissertation (London University)
- Jeffreys, M. (1973), Formulas in the Chronicle of the Morea, *Dumbarton Oak Papers* 27, 163-195
- Jeffreys, M. (1974), The Nature and Origins of the Political Verse, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 28, 141-195
- Jeffreys, M. (1975a), The Literary Emergence of Vernacular Greek, *Mosaic* 8.4, 171-194
- Jeffreys, M. (1975b), The Chronicle of the Morea: Priority of the Greek Version, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 68, 304-350
- Jeffreys, M. (1981), Byzantine Metrics: Non-Literary Strata, *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 31, 313-334
- Jeffreys, M. (1987), Η γλώσσα του Χρονικού του Μορέως – γλώσσα μιας προφορικής παράδοσης;. In H. Eideneier (ed.), *Neograeca medii aevi: Text und Ausgabe. Akten zum Symposium Köln 1986* (Cologne: Romiosini Verlag), 139-164
- Jeffreys, M. (1993a), Proposals for the Debate on the Question of Oral Influence in Early Modern Greek Poetry. In N. Panayotakis (ed.), *Origini della Letteratura Neogreca* (Venezia: Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini di Venezia), 251-266
- Jeffreys, M. (1993b), Early Modern Greek Verse: Parallels and Frameworks, *Modern Greek Studies* 1, 49-78
- Jeffreys, M. (2003), ‘Rhetorical’ Texts. In E. Jeffreys (ed.), *Rhetoric in Byzantium* (Aldershot: Variorum), 87-100
- Jeffreys, E. & M. (1971), Imberios and Margaron: The Manuscripts, Sources and Edition of a Byzantine Verse Romance, *Byzantion* 41, 122-160
- Jeffreys, E. & M. (1979), The Traditional Style of Early Demotic Verse, *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 5, 115-139

- Jeffreys, E. & M. (1983), The Style of Byzantine Popular Poetry: Recent Work. In C. Mango & O. Pritsak (eds.), *Okeanos. Essays presented to Ihor Ševčenko on his Sixtieth Birthday by his Colleagues and Students* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute), 309-343
- Jeffreys, E. & M. (1986), The Oral Background of Byzantine Popular Poetry, *Oral Tradition* 1.3, 504-547
- Jespersen, O. (1965), *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles* (London: Allen & Unwin)
- Jiménez Delgado, J.M. (2013), Adverbios temporales como conectores con valor consecutivo en griego antiguo, *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica: Estudios griegos e indoeuropeos* 23, 31-52
- Johnstone, B. (2008<sup>2</sup>), *Discourse Analysis* (Malden, MA: Blackwell)
- Joseph, B.D. (1987), Greek. In B. Comrie (ed.), *The World's Major Languages* (London: Croom Helm), 410-439
- Joseph, B.D. (1989), The Benefits of Morphological Classification: On Some Apparently Problematic Clitics in Modern Greek. In W. Dressler et al. (eds.), *Contemporary Morphology* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter), 171-181
- Joseph, B.D. (1990), *Morphology and Universals in Syntactic Change: Evidence from Medieval and Modern Greek* (New York/London: Garland)
- Joseph, B.D. (1992), The Morphosyntax of the Modern Greek Verbal Complex as Morphology and Not Syntax, *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 12, 33-43
- Joseph, B.D. (1998), Review of G. Drettas "Aspects Pontiques", *Mediterranean Language Review* 10, 210-212
- Joseph, B.D. (2000), Textual Authenticity: Evidence From Medieval Greek. In S. Herring, P. van Reenen & L. Schoesler (eds.), *Textual Parameters in Ancient Languages* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 309-329
- Jucker, A.H. & Ziv, Y. (1998), Discourse Markers: Introduction. In A.H. Jucker & Y. Ziv (eds.), *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and Theory* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 1-12
- Jucker, A.H. & Taavitsainen, I. (2010), *Historical Pragmatics* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter)
- Kallulli, D. (2008), Clitic Doubling, Agreement and Information Structure. In D. Kallulli & L. Tasmowski (eds.), *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 227-256
- Kaltenböck, G. (2005), Charting the Boundaries of Syntax: A Taxonomy of Spoken Parenthetical Clauses, *Vienna Working Papers* 14.1, 21-53
- Kaltenböck, G. (2007), Spoken Parenthetical Clauses in English: A Taxonomy. In N. Dehé & Y. Kavalova (eds.), *Parentheticals* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 25-52
- Kaltsa, M. & Sitaridou, I. (2010), Topicalisation in Pontic Greek. In A. Ralli, B.D. Joseph, M. Janse & A. Karasimos (eds.), *Online Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference of Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory, Chios, 11-14 June 2009* (Patras: University of Patras), 259-275
- Kambylis, A. (1995), Textkritik und Metrik, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 88, 38-67

- Karyolemou, M. (2014), What Can Sociolinguistics Tell us about Learned Literary Languages? In M. Hinterberger (ed.), *The Language of Byzantine Learned Literature* (Turnhout: Brepols), 34-51
- Katz, J.T. (2003), Oral Tradition in Linguistics, *Oral Tradition* 18.2, 261-262
- Kazazis, K. & Pentheroudakis, J. (1976), Reduplication of Indefinite Direct Objects in Albanian and Modern Greek, *Language* 52.2, 398-403
- Kening, L. (2008), Contrastive Focus Structure in Mandarin Chinese. In M. Chan & H. Kang (eds.), *Proceedings of the 20th North American Conference on Chinese Linguistics (NACCL-20)* (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University), 759-774
- Kim, K.-H. (1999), Phrasal Unit Boundaries and Organization of Turns and Sequences in Korean Conversation, *Human Studies* 22.2-4, 425-446
- Kirk, G.S. (1985), *The Iliad: A Commentary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Kirtchuk-Halevi, P.I. (2004), Definiteness (available at: <http://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/docs/00/55/82/04/PDF/Definiteness.PDF>; last access: 20/12/2014)
- Kisilier, M. (2003), Προσωπικές κλιτικές αντωνυμίες στο “Λειμώναριον” του Ιωάννου Μόσχου, paper given at the 6th International Conference of Greek Linguistics, Crete, 18-21/09/2003
- Kisilier, M. (2009), Ένα ελληνικό ιδίωμα στην Ανατολική Ουκρανία (περιοχή Μαριούπολης), *Acta linguistica Petropolitana* 4.1, 156-166
- Kisilier, M. (forthcoming), On the Greek Dialect of Marioupolis. In *Proceedings of the 6<sup>th</sup> Organization for the Internationalization of Greek Language Conference*
- Kiss, K.É. (2001), Discourse Configurationality. In M. Haspelmath, E. Köning & W. Oesterreicher (eds.), *Language Typology and Language Universals* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter), vol. 2, 1442-1455
- Koch, P. & Oesterreicher, W. (1985), Sprache der Nähe – Sprache der Distanz: Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit im Spannungsfeld von Sprachtheorie und Sprachgeschichte, *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* 36, 15-43
- Kondosopoulos, N. (1985), La Grèce du τί et la Grèce du εἶντα, *Γλωσσολογία* 2-3, 149-162
- Korais, A. (1828), Ἰτακτα: Παντοδαπῶν εἰς τὴν ἀρχαίαν καὶ τὴν νέαν ἑλληνικὴν γλῶσσαν αὐτοσχεδίων σημειώσεων αὐτοσχέδιος συναγωγή, vol. 1 (Athens: s.n.)
- Krapova, I. & Cinque, G. (2008), Clitic Reduplication Constructions in Bulgarian. In D. Kallulli & L. Tasmowski (eds.), *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 257-286
- Kriaras, E. (1955), *Βυζαντινὰ Ἱπποτικὰ Μυθιστορήματα* (Athens: Aetos)
- Krifka, M. (2006), Basic Notions of Information Structure. In C. Féry, G. Fanselow & M. Krifka (eds.), *The Notions of Information Structure* (Potsdam: Universitätsverlag Potsdam), 1-42
- Krumbacher, K. (1897<sup>2</sup>), *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur: von Justinian bis zum Ende des Oströmischen Reiches (527-1453)* (Munich: Beck)
- Kyriakidis, S. (1990), *Το δημοτικό τραγούδι: Συναγωγή μελετών* (Athens: Ermis)
- Lambert, J.A. (1935), *Le roman de Libistros et Rhodamné publié d'après les manuscrits de Leyde et de Madrid avec une introduction, des observations grammaticales et un glossaire* (Amsterdam: Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam)

- Lambrecht, K. (1981), *Topic, Antitopic and Verb Agreement in non-standard French* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins)
- Lambrecht, K. (1994), *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Larsen, I. (1991), Notes on the Function of γάρ, οὐν, μὲν, δε, καί, and τε in the Greek New Testament, *Notes on Translation* 5.1, 35-47
- Lascaratou, C. (1998), Basic Characteristics of Modern Greek Word Order. In A. Siewierska (ed.), *Constituent Order in the Languages of Europe* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter), 151-171
- Laum, B. (1928), *Das alexandrinische Akzentuationssystem unter Zugrundelegung der theoretischen Lehren der Grammatiker und mit Heranziehung der praktischen Verwendung in den Papyri* (Paderborn: Schöningh)
- Lauxtermann, M.D. (1998), The Velocity of Pure Iambs: Byzantine Observations on the Metre and Rhythm of the Dodecasyllable, *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 48, 9-33
- Lauxtermann, M.D. (1999), *The Spring of Rhythm: An Essay on the Political Verse and Other Byzantine Metres* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften)
- Lavagnini, R. (1988), *I fatti di Troia: l'Iliade bizantina del Cod. Paris. Suppl. GR 926* (Palermo: Università di Palermo)
- Lee, C.-H (2003), The Use of the Discourse Marker Say in Conversational English, *SNU Working Papers in English Language and Linguistics* 2, 133-156
- Lendari, T. (2007), *Livistros and Rodamne. The Vatican Version* (Athens: MIET)
- Lendari, T. & Manolissou, I. (2003), Η εκφορά του έμμεσου αντικειμένου στα μεσαιωνικά ελληνικά, *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 23, 394-405
- Lenk, U. (1998), *Marking Discourse Coherence: Functions of Discourse Markers in Spoken English* (Tübingen: Narr)
- Lewis, D.M. (2006), Discourse Markers in English: A Discourse-Pragmatic View. In K. Fischer (ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles* (Amsterdam: Elsevier), 43-59
- Lindahl, C. (1995), The Oral Undertones of Late Medieval Romance. In W.F.H. Nicolaisen (ed.), *Oral Tradition in the Middle Ages* (Binghamton, N.Y.: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies), 59-75
- Longacre, R.E. (1976), "Mystery" Particles and Affixes. In S. Mufwene, C. Walker & S. Steever (eds.), *Papers from the 12<sup>th</sup> Regional Meeting, April 23-25, 1976* (Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society), 468-475
- Loudová, K. (2007), *On Functional Analysis of Greek Sentence Structure*, paper given at the workshop "The Aspects of Linguistics in Classical Philology", Bratislava, 13-15/04/2007
- Loudová, K. (2008), *Cohesive Textual Means in Early Byzantine Chronicles*, paper given at the congress "Early European Languages in the Eyes of Modern Linguistics", Brno, 28/09-01/10/2008
- Loudová, K. (2009a), Cohesive Textual Means in Early Byzantine Chronicles as a Mirror of the Language Register. In K. Loudová & M. Žáková (eds.), *Early European Languages in the Eyes of Modern Linguistics* (Brno: Masarykova univerzita), 189-202

- Loudová, K. (2009b), Discourse Markers in Early Byzantine Narrative Prose, *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 29, 296-312
- Loudová, K. (2014), On the Category of Particles in Byzantium. In M. Hinterberger (ed.), *The Language of Byzantine Learned Literature* (Brepols: Turnhout), 147-169
- Lühr, R. (2008), Information Structure in Ancient Greek. In A. Steube (ed.), *The Discourse Potential of Underspecified Structures* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter:), 487-512
- Lurier, H.E. (1964), *Crusaders as Conquerors: The Chronicle of Morea* (New York: Columbia University Press)
- Lyavdansky, A. (2010), Temporal Deictic Adverbs as Discourse Markers in Hebrew, Aramaic and Akkadian, *Journal of Language Relationship* 3, 79-99
- Maas, P. (1903), Der byzantinische Zwölfsilber, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 12, 278-323
- Mackridge, P. (1985), *The Modern Greek Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Mackridge, P. (1990a), Orality in Medieval and Modern Greek Poetry: Introduction, *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 14, 123-128
- Mackridge, P. (1990b), The Metrical Structure of the Oral Decapentasyllable, *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 14, 200-212
- Mackridge, P. (1993), An Editorial Problem in Medieval Greek Texts. The Position of the Object Clitic Pronoun in the Escorial Digenes Akrites. In N. Panayotakis (ed.), *Origini della Letteratura Neogreca I* (Venezia: Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini di Venezia), 325-342
- Mackridge, P. (1995), On the Placement of the Weak Personal Pronoun in Medieval Greek Vernacular, *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 15, 906-929
- Mackridge, P. (1996), The Medieval Greek Infinitive in the Light of Modern Dialectal Evidence. In C. Constantinidis, N. Panagiotakis, E. Jeffreys, & A. Athanasios (eds.), *Φιλλέλην: Studies in Honour of Robert Browning* (Venice: Greek Institute of Venice), 191-204
- Mackridge, P. (2000), The Position of the Weak Object Pronoun in Medieval and Modern Greek, *Jazyk i řečevaja dejatel'nost' [Language and Language Behavior]* 3.1, 133-151
- Mackridge, P. (2009), *Language and National Identity in Greece, 1766-1976* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Mackridge, P. (2010), Modern Greek. In E. Bakker (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language* (Chicester: Wiley-Blackwell), 564-587
- Mackridge, P. (2014), The Christian Hellenism and Linguistic Archaism of Neofytos Doukas (1760-1845). In D. Tziovas (ed.), *Re-imagining the Past: Antiquity and Modern Greek Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 99-111
- Mambrini (2013), *Topic-Focus articulation à la praguienne. Annotating Information Structure in the Ancient Greek Dependency Treebank*, paper given at the e-Humanities autumn/winter school, Leipzig, 13/11/2013
- Manolessou, I. (2002), The Evolution of the Demonstrative System in Greek, *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 2.1, 119-148
- Manolessou, I. (2008), On Historical Linguistics, Linguistic Variation and Medieval Greek, *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 32.1, 63-79

- Manolessou, I. (2010), Modern Greek Dialectology and the Grammar of Medieval Greek. In A. Ralli, B.D. Joseph, M. Janse & A. Karasimos (eds.), *Online Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference of Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory, Chios, 11-14 June 2009* (Patras: University of Patras), 16-23
- Manolessou, I. & Stamatis B. (2006), Syntactic Isoglosses in Modern Greek Dialects: The Case of the Indirect Object. In M. Janse, B.D. Joseph & A. Ralli (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory* (Mytilene 2004) (Patras: University of Patras), 220-235
- Manoussages, M.I. (1952), Les romans byzantins de chevalerie et l'état des études les concernant, *Revue des études byzantines* 10, 70-83
- Marboeuf, C. (2009), *La Chronique de Morée. Structures narratives et temps du révolu*, PhD dissertation (Paris: INALCO)
- Marín Jordà, M.J. (2005), Discurs i gramaticalització: verbs de percepció usats com a marcadors discursius en el debat electoral, *Caplletra* 38, 47-71
- Markopoulos, T. (2009a), *The Future in Greek: From Ancient to Medieval* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Markopoulos, T. (2009b), Medieval Mediterranean as a Multilingual Area: The Greek Perspective. In A. Saxena & A. Viberg (eds.), *Proceedings of the 23<sup>rd</sup> Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics Uppsala University, 1-3 October 2008* (Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet), 245-257
- Marshall, M.B. (1987), *Verbs, Nouns and Postpositives in Attic Prose* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press)
- Martín-Portolés, J. (1999), Los marcadores del discurso. In I. Bosque & V. Demonte (eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española* (Madrid: Espasa Calpe)
- Martins, A.M. (2003), From Unity to Diversity in Romance Syntax: Portuguese and Spanish. In K. Braunmüller & G. Ferraresi (eds.), *Aspects of Multilingualism in European Language History* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 201-233
- Matei, M. (2010), Discourse Markers as Functional Elements, *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Braşov* 52.3, 119-126
- Mateos, J. (1994), Contribuciones al DGENT (Diccionario Griego-Español del Nuevo Testamento): πάλιν en el Nuevo Testamento, *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 7, 65-80
- Matić, D. (2003), Topic, Focus, and Discourse Structure: Ancient Greek Word Order, *Studies in Language* 27.3, 573-633
- Matisoff, J. (1991), Areal and Universal Dimensions of Grammaticalization in Lahu. In E.C. Traugott & B. Heine (eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), vol. 2, 383-454
- Matsumoto, K. (2000), Intonation Units, Clauses and Preferred Argument Structure in Conversational Japanese, *Language Sciences* 22.1, 63-86
- Matsumoto, K. (2003), Unit Linking in Conversational Japanese, *Language Sciences* 25, 433-455
- Mayser, E. (1970<sup>2</sup>), *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter)
- Meister, K. (1921), *Die Homerische Kunstsprache* (Leipzig: Teubner)

- Moennig, U. (2004), *Die Erzählung von Alexander und Semiramis: kritische Ausgabe mit einer Einleitung, Übersetzung und einem Wörterverzeichnis* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter)
- Mohrmann, C. (1933), Die psychologischen Bedingungen der konstruktionslosen Nominativi im Lateinischen, *Glotta* 21, 20-40
- Molinelli, P. (2010), From Verbs to Interactional Discourse Markers: The Pragmaticalization of Latin *rogo, quaeso*. In G. Calboli & P. Cuzzolin (eds.), *Papers on Grammar XI* (Rome: Herder Editrice), 181-192
- Morgan, G. (1983), Butz Triads: Towards a Grammar of Folk Poetry, *Folklore* 94, 44-56
- Morgan, J. (1975), Some Remarks on the Nature of Sentences. In R. Grossman et al. (eds.), *Papers from the Parasession on Functionalism* (Chicago, Ill.: Chicago Linguistic Society), 433-449
- Nakas, T. (2008), Ο έντεχνος λόγος των δημοτικών τραγουδιών (σχετικά με ορισμένα σχήματα λεξικής και φραστικής επανάληψης), *Σεμινάριο* 35, 137-149
- Nava, A. (2005), Comparing Tails. An Exploratory Study of Tails in Native Spoken English and Italian EFL Learners' Interlanguage, *Mots, Palabras, Words* 6, 71-92
- Nespor, M. & Vogel, I. (1986), *Prosodic Phonology* (Dordrecht: Foris)
- Noret, J. (1995), Notes de ponctuation et d'accentuation byzantines, *Byzantion* 65, 69-88
- Noret, J. (1998), L'accentuation de *te* en grec byzantin, *Byzantion* 68, 516-518
- Noret, J. & De Vocht, C. (1985-86), Une orthographe insolite et nuancé, celle de Nicéphore Blemmyde, ou à propos du δέ enclitique, *Byzantion* 55, 493-505
- Nørgaard, L. & Smith, O.L. (1975), *A Byzantine Iliad. The Text of Par. Suppl. Gr. 926* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press)
- Odorico, P. (2005), Καλλιμάχος, Χρυσορρόη και ένας πολύ μοναχικός. In E. & M. Jeffreys (eds.), *Approaches to Texts in Early Modern Greek (Neograeca Medii Aevi V)* (Oxford: University of Oxford), 271-286
- Oesterreicher, W. (1997), Types of Orality in Text. In: E. Bakker & A. Kahane (eds.), *Written Voices, Spoken Signs* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press), 190-214
- Ong, W.J. (1982), *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (London/New York: Routledge)
- Ong, W.J. (1984), Orality, Literacy, and Medieval Textualisation, *New Literary History*, 16.1, 1-12
- Östman, J.O. (1981), *You Know: A Discourse-Functional Approach* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins)
- Páez, M. (2012), Bibliography about Greek Particles (1935-2010), *Syntaktika* 42, 3-43
- Papadopoulos, A. (1955), *Ιστορική Γραμματική της Ποντικής Διαλέκτου* (Athens: Museum of Pontic Hellenism)
- Papadopoulos, A. (1961: 138), *Ιστορικόν Λεξικόν της Ποντικής Διαλέκτου* (Athens: Museum of Pontic Hellenism)
- Papathomopoulos, M. (1987), L'édition critique du ΠΟΛΕΜΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΤΡΩΑΔΟΣ: Problèmes méthodologiques. In H. Eideneier (ed.), *Neograeca medii aevi: Text und Ausgabe. Akten zum Symposion Köln 1986* (Cologne: Romiosini Verlag), 279-284
- Papathomopoulos, M. & Jeffreys, E. (1996), *Ὁ Πόλεμος τῆς Τρωάδος* (Athens: MIET)

- Pappas, P. (2001), Weak Object Pronoun Placement in Later Medieval Greek: Intralinguistic Parameters Affecting Variation, *The Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics* 56, 79-106
- Pappas, P. (2002), The Imperative and Weak Object Pronoun Placement in Later Medieval Greek, *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 22, 234-248
- Pappas, P. (2004), *Variation and Morphosyntactic Change in Greek. From Clitics to Affixes* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan)
- Pappas, P. (2006), Object Clitic Placement in the Dialects of Medieval Greek. In M. Janse, B.D. Joseph & A. Ralli (eds.), *Proceedings of the Second International Conference of Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory* (Mytilene 2004) (Patras: University of Patras), 314-328
- Parides, A. (2009), *The Fifteen-Syllable Verse of Kostis Palamas's 'The King's Flute'*, Master thesis (University of Birmingham)
- Park, J. (2002), Cognitive and Interactional Motivations for the Intonation Unit, *Studies in Language* 26.3, 637-680
- Peri, M. (2012), Il ricordo della musica nei versi greci medievali e moderni: un confronto con la situazione romanza, *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici* 49, 105-170
- Pethukova, V. & Bunt, H. (2009), Towards a Multidimensional Semantics of Discourse Markers in Spoken Dialogue. In H. Bunt, V. Petukhova & S. Wubben (eds.), *Proceedings of the Eighth International Workshop on Computational Semantics* (Tilburg: University of Tilburg), 157-168
- Philippaki-Warbuton, I., (1985), Word Order in Modern Greek, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 83, 113-143
- Philippaki-Warbuton, I. (1990), Η ανάλυση του ρηματικού συνόλου στα νέα ελληνικά, *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 10, 119-138
- Philippaki-Warbuton, I. (1994), Verb Movement and Clitics in Modern Greek. In I. Philippaki-Warbuton, K. Nicolaidis & M. Sifianou (eds.), *Themes in Greek Linguistics I* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 53-60
- Philippaki-Warbuton, I. (1998), Functional Categories and Modern Greek Syntax, *Linguistic Review* 15, 159-186
- Phillips, C. (2009), *Second Position in Ancient Greek: Clitics and Particles in the Oratory of Demosthenes*, paper given at 3<sup>rd</sup> annual Cornell Undergraduate Linguistics Colloquium, Ithaca, 04/04/2009
- Plank, F. (1981), Modalitätsausdruck zwischen Autonomie und Auxiliarität. In I. Rosengren (ed.), *Sprache und Pragmatik. Lunder Symposium 1980* (Lund: CWK Gleerup), 57-71
- Politi-Sakellariadi, M. (1987), Προβλήματα της έκδοσης του 'Λόγου Παρηγορητικού περί Δυστυχίας καὶ Ευτυχίας'. In H. Eideneier (ed.), *Neograeca medii aevi: Text und Ausgabe. Akten zum Symposion Köln 1986* (Cologne: Romiosini Verlag), 285-294
- Politis, A. (2010), *Το δημοτικό τραγούδι* (Heraklion: Crete University Press)
- Politis, L. (1998), *Ιστορία της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας* (Athens: MIET)
- Pons Bordería, S. (1998), *Conexión y conectores. Estudio de su relación en el registro informal de la lengua* (Valencia: Universidad de València)



- Porter, S.E. & O'Donnell, M.B. (2007), Conjunctions, Clines and Levels of Discourse, *Filología Neotestamentaria* 20, 3-14
- Prince, E.F. (1981), Toward a Taxonomy of Given-New Information. In P. Cole (ed.) *Radical Pragmatics* (New York: Academic Press), 223-255
- Pring, J.T. (1975<sup>2</sup>), *The Oxford Dictionary of Modern Greek* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Prombonas, I.K. (2008), Ο Όμηρος και το δημοτικό τραγούδι, *Σεμινάριο* 35, 23-36
- Puigdollers, A.R. (2006), Word Classes, Functions and Syntactic Level: The Case of *πάλιν*. In E. Crespo, J. de la Villa & A.R. Revuelta (eds.), *Word Classes and Related Topics in Ancient Greek: Proceedings of the Conference on "Greek Syntax and Word Classes" held in Madrid on 18-21, June 2003* (Leuven: Peeters), 455-469
- Puigdollers, A.R. (2010), *Estructuras tematizadoras y topicalizadoras en griego moderno*, paper given at "XXXIX Simposio Internacional de la Sociedad Española de Lingüística", Santiago de Compostela, 01-04/02/2010
- Ralli, A. (2006), Syntactic and Morpho-Syntactic Phenomena in Modern Greek Dialects: The State of Art, *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 7, 121-159
- Ramoutsaki, I. (1996), Η πρόταξη και επίταξη των προσωπικών εγκλιτικών αντωνυμιών σε κείμενα της μεσαιωνικής δημώδους λογοτεχνίας. In J.M. Egea & J. Alonso (eds.), *Prosa y Verso en Griego Medieval. Rapports of the International Congress "Neograeca Medii Aevi III" Vitoria 1994* (Amsterdam: Hakker), 317-320
- Reichl, K. (2011), *Medieval Oral Literature* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter)
- Reinhart, T. (1981), Pragmatics and Linguistics. An Analysis of Sentence Topics, *Philosophica* 27, 53-94
- Revithiadou, A. & Spyropoulos, V. (2006), *A Typology of Greek Clitics with Special Reference to their Diachronic Environment*, paper given at the 27<sup>th</sup> Conference on Greek Linguistics, Thessaloniki, 06-07/05/2006
- Revithiadou, A. & Spyropoulos, V. (2008), Greek Object Clitic Pronouns: A Typological Survey of their Grammatical Properties, *Language Typology and Universals* 61, 39-53
- Rizzo Nervo, F. (2000), *Il Vecchio Cavaliere* (Soveria Mannelli: Rubbettino)
- Robertson, A.T. (1934), *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville, TN: Broadman Press)
- Rollo, A. (1989), L'uso dell'enclisi nel greco volgare dal XII al XVII secolo e la legge Tobler-Mussafia, *Ιταλοελληνικά* 2, 135-146
- Rollo, A. (2008), 'Greco medievale' e 'greco bizantino', *AIWN* 30, 429-473
- Romaos, K. (1963), *Ο νόμος τῶν τριῶν στὸ δημοτικὸ τραγούδι*, PhD dissertation (University of Athens)
- Rosen, H. (1992), Die Arten der Prolepse im Lateinischen in typologischer Sicht. In O. Panagl & T. Krisch (eds.), *Latein und Indogermanisch, Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft (Salzburg, 23.-26. September 1986)* (Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft), 243-262
- Rosenqvist, J.O. (2007), *Die byzantinische Literatur. Vom 6. Jahrhundert bis zum Fall Konstantinopels 1453* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter)

- Rouchota, V. (1998), Procedural Meaning and Parenthetical Discourse Markers. In A. Jucker & Y. Ziv (eds.), *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and Theory* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 97-126
- Rubio, G. (2009), Semitic Influence in the History of Latin Syntax. In P. Baldi & P. Cuzzolin (eds.), *New Perspectives on Latin Syntax* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter), 195-240
- Ruijgh, C.J. (1990), La place des enclitiques dans l'ordre des mots chez Homère d'après la loi de Wackernagel. In H. Eichner & H. Rix (eds.), *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie. Jacob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute* (Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert Verlag), 213-233
- Runge, S.E. (2008), *Left-Dislocations and their Contribution to Information Structure*, paper given at the SBL annual meeting, Boston, 22-25/11/2008
- Salas, F.J.O. (1998a), *Florio y Platzia Flora: una novela bizantina de época paleológica* (Madrid: Universidad de Cádiz)
- Salas, F.J.O. (1998b), Las ediciones de la novela bizantina de época paleológica Florio y Platzia Flora, *Habis* 29, 323-333
- Salas, F.J.O. (2001), Contribución al Estudio de la Lengua Medieval Griega. El Caso de *Imberio y Margarona* y *Florio y Platzia Flora* (adverbio, preposición y conjunciones), *HABIS* 32, 597-615
- Scheppers, F. (2011), *The Colon Hypothesis. Word Order, Discourse Segmentation and Discourse Coherence in Ancient Greek* (Brussels: VUBPress)
- Schiffrin, D. (1987), *Discourse Markers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Schmitt, J. (1904), *The Chronicle of Morea: A History in Political Verse, Relating the Establishment of Feudalism in Greece by the Franks in the Thirteenth Century* (London: Methuen)
- Schmitt, N. (2004), *Formulaic Sequences in Action. Acquisition, Processing and Use* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins)
- Schneider, S. (2007), *Reduced Parentheticals as Mitigators. A Corpus Study of Spoken French, Italian and Spanish* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins)
- Schourup, L. (1999), Tutorial Overview: Discourse Markers, *Lingua* 107, 227-265
- Schourup, L. (2011), The Discourse Marker now: A Relevance-Theoretic Approach, *Journal of Pragmatics* 43.8, 2110-2129
- Schwyzer, E. (1939), Die Parenthese im engern und im weitern Sinne, *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse* 6, 1-49
- Schwyzer, E. (1950), *Griechische Grammatik. Auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik* (München: Beck)
- Selkirk, E. (1984), *Phonology and Syntax. The Relation between Sound and Structure* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press)
- Selting, M. (1996), On the Interplay of Syntax and Prosody in the Constitution of Turn-Constructional Units and Turns in Conversation, *Pragmatics* 6.3, 357-388
- Selting, M. (2000), The Construction of Units in Conversational Talk, *Language in Society* 29, 477-517
- Serbat, G. (1991), Intégration à la phrase latine d'un groupe nominal sans fonction syntaxique, *Langages* 104, 22-32

- Shawcross, T. (2005), Oral Residue and Narrative Structure in the Chronicle of Morea, *Byzantion* 75, 310-333
- Shawcross, T. (2009), *The Chronicle of Morea: Historiography in Crusader Greece*. *Oxford Studies in Byzantium* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Shawcross, T. (2010), "Listen, all of you, both Franks and Romans": The Narrator in the Chronicle of Morea. In R. Macrides (ed.), *History as Literature in Byzantium* (Farnham: Ashgate), 93-111
- Shing Chung Kwong, I. (2005), *The Word Order of the Gospel of Luke: Its Foreground Messages* (London: T&T Clark)
- Sifakis, G.M. (1988), *Για μια ποιητική του ελληνικού δημοτικού τραγουδιού* (Heraklion: Crete University Press)
- Sifakis, G.M. (1992), Homeric Survivals in the Medieval and Modern Greek Folksong Tradition? *Greece & Rome* 39, 139-54
- Sifakis, G.M. (1997), Formulas and their Relatives: A Semiotic Approach to Verse Making in Homer and Modern Greek Folksongs, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 118, 136-53
- Sifakis, G.M. (2001), Looking for the Tracks of Oral Tradition in Medieval and Early Modern Greek Poetic Works, *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora* 27, 61-86
- Sitaridou, I. (2014), The Romeyka Infinitive: Continuity, Contact and Change in the Hellenic varieties of Pontus, *Diachronica* 31.1, 23-73
- Slings, S.R. (1992), Written and Spoken Language: An Exercise in the Pragmatics of the Greek Sentence, *Classical Philology* 87.2, 95-109
- Slings, S.R. (1994), Een tandje lager: Aanzetten voor een orale grammatica van Homerus, *Lampas* 27.5, 411-427
- Slings, S.R. (1999), Information Unit and Metrical Unit. In I.L. Pfeijffer & S.R. Slings (eds.), *One Hundred Years of Bacchylides. Proceedings of a Colloquium held at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam* (Amsterdam: V.U. University Press), 61-75
- Slings, S.R. (2002), Oral Strategies in the Language of Herodotus. In E. Bakker, I. de Jong & H. van Wees (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden: Brill), 53-77
- Smith, O.L. (1987), Versions and Manuscripts of the Achilleid. In H. Eideneier (ed.), *Neograeca medii aevi: Text und Ausgabe. Akten zum Symposium Köln 1986* (Cologne: Romiosini Verlag), 315 -325
- Smith, O.L. (1996), Towards a New Approach to the Byzantine Vernacular Romances. In J.M. Egea & J. Alonso (eds.), *Prosa y Verso en Griego Medieval. Rapports of the International Congress "Neograeca Medii Aevi III" Vitoria 1994* (Amsterdam: Hakkert), 331-339
- Smyth, H. (2002<sup>12</sup>), *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press)
- Soltic, J. (2012), Distribution of the Object Clitic Pronouns in the Grottaferrata Manuscript of the Digenis Akritis, *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 36.2, 178-197
- Soltic, J. (2013a), The Πολιτικὸς Στίχος Poetry as Reliable Evidence for Certain Linguistic Phenomena. Case-study: The Position of Object Clitic Pronouns in the Chronicle of Morea, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 106.2, 811-842

- Soltic, J. (2013b), A Defence of the Focus Hypothesis Concerning Late Medieval Greek Object Clitic Pronouns: A Case Study of Light Verbs in the *Chronicle of Morea*, *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 14.2, 185-209
- Soltic, J. (2013c), Clitic Doubling In Vernacular Medieval Greek, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 111.3, 379-405
- Soltic, J. (2013d), Late Medieval Greek πάλιν: A Discourse Marker Signaling Topic Switch, *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 53.2, 390-419
- Soltic, J. (2014a), The Late Medieval Greek Vernacular Πολιτικός Στίχος Poetry: A Modern Linguistic Analysis into Intonation Units, *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 14.1, 84-116
- Soltic, J. (2014b), Γνώριζε in the Greek War of Troy: A Peremptory Command or just a Filled Pause?, *Byzantion* 84, 329-355
- Soltic, J. (2014c), Notice on “I. N. Kazazis et al., Λεξικό της Μεσαιωνικής Ελληνικής Δημώδους Γραμματείας 1100-1669, vol. 18: προβιδιάζω-ραβέντι”, *Byzantion* 84, 531-552 (notices bibliographiques)
- Soltic, J. (2014d), The Particle γάρ: From Ancient Greek Sentence Connector to Blatant Line Filler? A Case-Study on the Late Medieval Greek *Chronicle of Morea*, *Symbolae Osloenses* 88.1, 136-147
- Soltic, J. (forthcoming), Parenthetical “I say (you)” in Late Medieval Greek Vernacular: A Message Structuring Discourse Marker rather than a Message Conveying Verb, *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*
- Soltic, J. & Janse, M. (2012), From Enclisis to Proclisis in Medieval Greek: Σε λέγω and its Uses in the *Chronicle of Morea*, *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 52.2, 240-258
- Soltic, J., Janse, M. & Bentein, K. (2013), Δηλώσω σοι γὰρ τὰς πράξεις (DA G 1.13): A Note on the Order of Clitic Pronouns and Particles in the Grottaferrata *Digenis Akritis*, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 105.2, 733-742
- Spadaro, G. (1978), L'inedito Polemos tis Troados e l'Achilleide, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 71, 1-9
- Spadaro, G. (1987), Edizioni critiche di testi greci medievali in lingua demotica: difficoltà e prospettive. In H. Eideneier (ed.), *Neograeca medii aevi: Text und Ausgabe. Akten zum Symposium Köln 1986* (Cologne: Romiosini Verlag), 327-356
- Spadaro, G. (1993), Oralità nella Letteratura Greca Medievale in Demotico? In N. Panayotakis (ed.), *Origini della Letteratura Neograeca* (Venezia: Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini di Venezia), vol. 1, 285-305
- Spevak, O. (2010), *Constituent Order in Classical Latin Prose* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins)
- Stavrou, T. (1992), *Νεοελληνική Μετρική* (Thessaloniki: Aristotle University)
- Stenström, A.B. (1990), Pauses in Monologue and Dialogue. In J. Svartvik (ed.), *The London-Lund Corpus of Spoken English: Description and Research* (Lund: Lund University Press), 211-252
- Svennung, J. (1935), *Untersuchungen zu Palladius und zur lateinischen Fach- und Volkssprache* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell)
- Swerts, M. (1998), Filled Pauses as Markers of Discourse Structure, *Journal of Pragmatics* 30, 485-496

- Symeonides, C. (1981), Η ερμηνεία της ονομασίας “Πολιτικός Στίχος”, *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 2, 229-243
- Szczepek Reed, B. (2010), Units of Interaction: ‘Intonation Phrases’ or ‘Turn Constructional Phrases’?. In E. Delais-Roussarie (ed.), *Conference Proceedings: Interface Discourse and Prosody* (Paris: University of Chicago), 351-363
- Taavitsainen, I. & Jucker, A. (2010), Trends and Developments in Historical Pragmatics. In A. Jucker & I. Taavitsainen (eds.), *Historical Pragmatics* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter), 3-30
- Tachibana, T. (1994), Spatial Expressions in Byzantine Vernacular Greek. In I. Philippaki-Warbuton, K. Nikolaides & M. Sifanou (eds.), *Themes in Greek Linguistics I* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 427-434
- Tao, H.-Y. (1996), *Units in Mandarin Conversation* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins)
- Terzi (1999), Cypriot Greek Clitics and their Positioning Restrictions. In A. Alexiadou, G. Horrocks & M. Stavrou (eds.), *Studies in Greek Syntax* (Dordrecht: Kluwer), 227-240
- Thoma, C.A. (2007), Distribution and Function of Clitic Object Pronouns in Popular 16<sup>th</sup> -18<sup>th</sup> Century Greek Narratives. A Synchronic and Diachronic Perspective. In J. Rehbein, C. Hohenstein & L. Pietsch (eds.), *Connectivity in Grammar and Discourse* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 139-163
- Thoma, C.A. (2011), The Function of the Historical Present Tense: Evidence from Modern Greek, *Journal of Pragmatics* 43.9, 2373-2391
- Thrall, M.E. (1962), *Greek Particles in the New Testament: Linguistic and Exegetical Studies* (Leiden: Eerdmans)
- Thumb, A. (1910<sup>2</sup>), *Handbuch der neugriechischen Volkssprache* (Strassburg: Trübner)
- Thumb, A. (1912), *Handbook of the Modern Greek Vernacular*, translated by S. Angus (Edinburgh: T&T Clark)
- Tomić, O. (2006), Clitic Clusters and Clitic Doubling, Balkan Sprachbund and Morpho-Syntactic Features, *Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 67, 239-331
- Tonnet, H. (1987), Aperçu sur l'évolution des particules de liaison (joncteurs) en grec. In J. Feuillet, H. Tonnet & C. Poghiric (eds.), *Linguistique: particules, emprunts lexicaux, langues anciennes* (Paris: Publications Langues'O), 134-150
- Tonnet, H. (1993), *Histoire du Grec Moderne* (Paris: L'Asiathèque)
- Topping, P. (1965), Review of H.E. Lurier “Crusaders as Conquerors: The Chronicle of Morea”, *Speculum* 40.4, 737-742
- Toufexis, N. (2006), Register Variation and the Grammar of Medieval Greek. In E. Jeffreys & F.K. Haarer (eds.), *Proceedings of the 21st International Congress of Byzantine Studies, London, 21-26 August 2006* (Burlington: Ashgate), vol. 2, 141-142
- Toufexis, N. (2008), Diglossia and Register Variation in Medieval Greek, *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 32.2, 203-217
- Toufexis, N. (2010), One Era's Nonsense, Another's Norm: Diachronic Study of Greek and the Computer. In G. Bodard & S. Mahony (eds.), *Digital Research in the Study of Classical Antiquity* (Farnham: Ashgate), 105-118

- Toufexis, N. & Thoma, C. (2004), *The Distribution of the Discourse Marker 'kai' in Greek Narratives*, paper given at the “Logos Conference. Controlling Language”, London, 09-11/09/2004
- Trapp, E. (1965), *Der Dativ und der Ersatz seiner Funktionen in der byzantinischen Vulgärdichtung bis zur Mitte des 15. Jh.*, *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 14, 21-34
- Trapp, E. (1993), *Learned and Vernacular Literature in Byzantium: Dichotomy or Symbiosis?* *Dumbarton Oak Papers* 47, 115-129
- Traugott, E.C. (1995), *The Role of the Development of Discourse Markers in a Theory of Grammaticalization*, paper given at the 12<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Manchester, 13-18/08/1995
- Traugott, E.C. & Dasher, R.B. (2001), *The Development of Adverbials with Discourse Marker Function*. In E.C. Traugott & R.B. Dasher (eds.), *Regularity in Semantic Change* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 152-189
- Tree, J.E. & Schrock, J.C. (1999), *Discourse Markers in Spontaneous Speech: Oh What a Difference an Oh Makes*, *Journal of Memory and Language* 40.2, 280-295
- Trenkner, S. (1948), *Le style καί dans le récit Attique oral* (Bruxelles: Éditions de l’Institut d’Études polonaises en Belgique)
- Triandaphylidis, M. (1982), *Νεοελληνική Γραμματική* (Athens: Οργανισμός Εκδόσεως Σχολικών Βιβλίων)
- Trypanis, C. A. (1963), *Byzantine Oral Poetry*, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 56.1, 1-3
- Trypanis, C.A. (1981), *Greek Poetry from Homer to Seféris* (London: Faber and Faber)
- Tseng, S.-C. (2006), *Linguistic Markings of Units in Spontaneous Mandarin*, *ISCSLP Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence*, 43-54
- Tseng, S.-C. (2008), *Spoken Corpora and Analysis of Natural Speech*, *Taiwan Journal of Linguistics* 6.2, 1-25
- Urmson, J.O. (1952), *Parenthetical Verbs*, *Mind* 61, 480-496
- Uygur-Distexhe, D. (2010), *Right Peripheral Discourse Markers in SMS: The Case of alors, donc and quoi*, paper given at the 5<sup>th</sup> University Postgraduate Conference in Linguistics & Language Teaching, Lancaster, July 2010
- Valioui, M. (1994), *Anaphora, Agreement and the Pragmatics of ‘Right Dislocation’ in Greek*, *Journal of Semantics* 11, 55-82
- Van der Merwe, C.H.J. (1989), *The Vague Term ‘Emphasis’*, *Journal for Semitics* 1.1, 118-132
- van Dijk-Wittop Koning, A.M. (1972), *Some Remarks on the Syntactical Phenomenon Parataxis in Contemporary Modern Greek and Earlier Stages*. In W.F. Bakker, A.F. van Gemert & W.J. Aerts (eds.), *Studia Byzantina et Neohellenica Neerlandica Neerlandica* (Leiden: Brill), 241-269
- van Dijk, T.A. (1977), *Sentence Topic and Discourse Topic*, *Papers in Slavic Philology* 1, 49-61
- van Riemsdijk, H. (1997), *Left Dislocation*. In E. Anagnostopoulou, H. van Riemsdijk & F. Zwarts (eds.), *Materials on Left Dislocation* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins), 1-10

- Vejleskov, P. (2005), The Position of the Weak Object Pronoun in the *Greek Portulans* and in the *Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans*. In E. & M. Jeffreys (eds.), *Approaches to Texts in Early Modern Greek (Neograeca Medii Aevi V)* (Oxford: University of Oxford), 197-209
- Vermeulen, R. (2010), *The Syntax of Topic, Contrast and Contrastive Topic in Japanese and Korean*, paper given at the congress “On Linguistics Interfaces II”, Ulster, 02-04/12/2010
- Vitz, E.B., Regalado, N.F. & Lawrence, M. (2005), *Performing Medieval Narrative* (Cambridge: Brewer)
- Wackernagel, J. (1892), Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1, 333-446
- Wackernagel, J. (1924), *Vorlesungen über Syntax: mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch* (Basel: Birkhäuser)
- Wahlgren, S. (1995), *Sprachwandel im Griechisch der frühen römischen Kaiserzeit* (Göteborg: Acta universitatis Gothoburgensis)
- Wahlgren, S. (2002), Towards a Grammar of Byzantine Greek, *Symbolae Osloenses* 77.1, 201-204
- Wahlgren, S. (2003), Particles in Byzantine Historical Texts. In A. Piltz et al. (eds.), *For Particular Reasons. Studies in Honour of Jerker Blomqvist* (Lund: Nordic Academic Press), 333-340
- Wagner, W. (1881), *Trois poèmes grecs du Moyen-Age* (Berlin: Calvary)
- Waltereit, R. (2002), Imperatives, Interruption in Conversation, and the Rise of Discourse Markers: A Study of Italian *Guarda*, *Linguistics* 40.5, 987-1010
- Wannowski, A. (1835), *Syntaxeos anomalae Graecorum* (Leipzig: Vogel)
- Watts, R.J., (1989), Taking the Pitcher to ‘well’: Native Speakers’ Perception of their Use of Discourse Markers in Conversation, *Journal of Pragmatics* 13.2, 203-237
- Weil, H. (1879<sup>3</sup>), *De l'ordre des mots dans les langues anciennes comparées aux langues modernes. Question de grammaire générale* (Paris: Joubert)
- Westbury, J.R. (2010), *Towards a Discourse-Pragmatic Description of Left-Dislocation in Biblical Hebrew*, Master thesis (University of Stellenbosch)
- Wichmann, A. (2001), Spoken Parentheticals. In K. Aijmer (ed.), *A Wealth of English (Studies in Honour of Göran Kjellmer)* (Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis), 177-193
- Wills, J. (1993), Homeric Particle Order, *Historische Sprachforschung* 106.1, 61-81
- Wills, L.M. (2002), *The Quest of the Historical Gospel: Mark, John and the Origins of the Gospel Genre* (London/New York: Routledge)
- Wilson, D. & Sperber, D. (1993), Linguistic Form and Relevance, *Lingua* 90, 1-25
- Wouk, F. (2008), The Syntax of Intonation Units in Sasak, *Studies in Language* 32.1, 137-162
- Wray, A. (2002), *Formulaic Language and the Lexicon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Wray, A. & Perkins, M. (2000), The Functions of Formulaic Language: An Integrated Model, *Language & Communication* 20, 1-28
- Zakowski, S. (2014), Εἰπέ μοι as a Parenthetical: A Structural and Functional Analysis, from Homer to Menander, *Greek Roman & Byzantine Studies* 54.2, 157-191
- Ziv, Y. (1985), Parentheticals and Functional Grammar. In A.M. Bolkestein et al (eds.), *Syntax and Pragmatics in Functional Grammar* (Dordrecht: Foris), 181-199

- Ziv, Y. (1994), Left and Right Dislocations: Discourse Functions and Anaphora, *Journal of Pragmatics* 22, 629-645
- Zumthor, P. (1989), *La lettre et la voix de la "littérature" médiévale* (Paris: Seuil)
- Zwicky, A. (1977), *On Clitics* (Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club)



